

these matters have to be dealt with in this House and the remarks I have made regarding the position at Bicton also apply to the area in South Perth.

There is part of a reserve at Kalgoorlie, which is also included in the Bill. In 1907, a 999 years' lease covering the land in question was granted for a hall site to three trustees of the Eastern Goldfields Brewery Employees' Union of Workers. The trustees have since changed under the rules of the union, but as in the lease no provision was made for succession and one of the original trustees cannot be located, it is desired that the present lease be cancelled and a similar lease issued to the new trustees. That is all that is involved in the provision regarding the Kalgoorlie area.

An addition to the Bill of last year, to which I originally referred, involves an area that was portion of the public education endowment area in the vicinity of the Katanning railway yards. The local road board intends to establish stock saleyards at Katanning on part of the area marked on the plan, which I submit to the House. That portion of the area has been acquired from the education endowment trustees and the Commissioner of Railways has entered into an agreement with the road board to construct new trucking yards and a siding on the area excised from the education endowment land. The trustees have agreed to surrender these lots to the Crown and the road board has agreed to pay the value of the area. That describes all the transactions necessary to complete the arrangements for the transference of the areas I have mentioned. Later in the session another Bill will be introduced to deal with other reserves, but, as I pointed out at the initial stage of my remarks, importance attaches to the early consideration of those embodied in the Bill now before the House because many matters are held up awaiting its passage. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Mann, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.3 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Wednesday, 13th September, 1939.*

	Page
Ministerial statement: Loan expenditure, Albany and neighbouring districts .....	593
Questions: Unemployment, youths' registration, grants and benefits .....	598
Health Act, inspection of flats .....	594
Hospitals, superannuation benefits for staffs .....	594
Plant Diseases Act, appointment of fruit-fly inspector .....	594
Motions: Native Administration Act, to disallow regulations .....	594
Metropolitan Milk Act, to disallow regulations and schedule .....	595
Unemployed, homes: building materials and land allotments .....	595
Bills: Contraceptives, 3A. ....	595
Plant Diseases Act Amendment, 3A. ....	595
Life Assurance Companies Act Amendment, report .....	595

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

#### *Loan Expenditure, Albany and Neighbouring Districts.*

The DEPUTY PREMIER: On Thursday last the member for Katanning (Mr. Watts) asked questions on notice regarding the total of loan money expended during the five years ended the 30th June, 1939, and as to how much had been expended 1, on the port of Albany; 2, in the remainder of the Albany electoral district; and 3, in the road districts of Plantagenet, Cranbrook, Gnowangerup, Tambellup, Broomehill, Kent and Katanning. I replied to the first question on Thursday last, and now reply to the other questions as follows:—1, £4,114; 2, £99,687; 3, £52,029.

### QUESTION—UNEMPLOYMENT.

#### *Youths' Registration, Grants and Benefits.*

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER asked the Minister for Employment:—1, How many youths over school age and under 25 years registered with the Government Labour Bureau for employment? 2, How many between the ages of 18 and 25 years registered? 3, What is the total amount of Commonwealth grants received by the Western Australian Government for youth employment since 1931 to date? 4, What are the details of the expenditure of such grants? 5, Is any scheme in operation whereby youths between the ages of 18 and 25 years

—known as the lost legion—are receiving direct benefit from the money granted for youth employment? 6, If so, how many? 7, Does the Government grant any cash allowance to youths of this class during their training? 8, If so, in what trades? 9, What is the amount granted to each youth?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT replied: 1, Since the 1st August, 1939, the number of youths registered was 234, and the number placed 112. 2, Since the 1st August, 1939, the number registered was 97, and the number placed 78. 3, The State has received £28,000 in grants from the Commonwealth Government under the specific condition that this money be utilised for buildings and permanent equipment for technical education. 4, Kalgoorlie School of Mines, £3,000; Wiluna School of Mines, £1,890; Muresk College of Agriculture, £3,200; Perth Technical College, £17,500; Fremantle Technical School, £500; Midland Junction Technical School, £550; Collic High School, £660; Boulder Technical School, £200; Country training, £500. Total, £28,000. 5, The existing technical educational facilities are open to unemployed youths between the ages of 18 and 25 without payment of fees. 6, During 1939 fees have been waived in the case of 76 unemployed applicants. This does not include those youths eligible for free tuition by virtue of their educational qualifications. 7, No. 8 and 9, See answer to No. 7.

### QUESTION—HEALTH ACT.

#### *Inspection of Flats.*

Hon. C. G. LATHAM asked the Minister for Health:—1, Has any inspection of flats within the City of Perth area been made recently in accordance with the provisions of Section 98 of the Health Act, 1911-1937? 2, If so, will the Minister make available for perusal by members the inspector's report before the vote on the motion for the disallowance of Regulation 6A under the said Act is taken?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes.

### QUESTION—HOSPITALS.

#### *Superannuation Benefits for Staffs.*

Hon. C. G. LATHAM asked the Minister for Health:—1, Are the nursing staff and other permanent employees engaged

in Government hospitals regarded as Government employees? 2, Are they not permitted to become contributors to the fund established under the Superannuation and Family Benefits Act, 1938? 3, If not, why? 4, Does the Government intend to provide that these employees shall have the same opportunity as other Government employees to become contributors to the fund?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, Because of the definition of "Department" in Section (6), part of which reads: "the employees whereof are remunerated with moneys (other than grants) appropriated by the Parliament of the State to the purpose of such Crown instrumentality." The hospital employees are paid out of the National Hospital Fund, which is not appropriated by the Parliament of the State. 4, This matter is under consideration with a view to having them included by an amendment of the Act.

### QUESTION—PLANT DISEASES ACT.

#### *Appointment of Fruit-fly Inspector.*

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Agriculture:—1, In view of the difficulties relating to the fruit industry in the hills districts, does the Minister intend to appoint forthwith a fruit-fly inspector to fill the position recently vacated? 2, If not, will he indicate when the appointment is to be made?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1 and 2, The matter is receiving consideration and as soon as sufficient money is available in the Orchard Registration Fund an appointment will be made.

### MOTION—NATIVE ADMINISTRATION ACT.

#### *To Disallow Regulations.*

MR. NEEDHAM (Perth) [4.36]: I move—

That Regulations Nos. 134 to 139A, inclusive, of the regulations made under the Native Administration Act, 1905-36, as published in the "Government Gazette" of the 8th September, 1939, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 12th September, 1939, be and are hereby disallowed.

Members will recall that early last year regulations tabled in this House under

the Native Administration Act caused a considerable amount of dissatisfaction, so much so that they were withdrawn, new regulations being tabled. I am not suggesting dissatisfaction exists with the regulations now tabled by the Minister for the North-West. On the contrary, general satisfaction prevails with the regulations. A feeling is abroad that so long as the present Minister is in charge of the administration of native affairs, not only will there be a more efficient but also a more sympathetic administration of his department. One point upon which there is uneasiness, however, is in connection with the regulations governing the admission of representatives of churches to mission stations. Members will also recall that after the outcry last year and the temporary withdrawal of the regulations, we discovered when the fresh regulations were tabled, that there was an alteration of only a single word in the particular regulations to which I have just referred, the word "permit" being substituted for the word "license." As far as I can judge, nothing has occurred since to cause Parliament to change its mind. The only alteration I perceive in Regulations 134 to 139A is that the word "non-conformist" has been substituted for another. That word has no application to churches in this State. There are no non-conformist churches in Western Australia or in the Commonwealth because there is no Established Church in this country. Therefore the word used is quite out of place. Regulation 139A again provides for a board of reference, so that if any religious organisation is dissatisfied at being refused a permit to preach the gospel to the natives, it can appeal to the board. However, to my mind such a board is farcical. It perpetuates the old system that operated in the Public Service of an appeal from Caesar to Caesar. The Commissioner of Native Affairs is to be a member of the board of reference; consequently he will be sitting in judgment on himself. However the position is viewed, I consider that Regulations 134 to 139A, as tabled yesterday by the Minister for the North-West, leave the situation just as it was last year and dissatisfaction still exists. Consideration has been given to the regulations by the Native Welfare Council. Members of the council had an opportunity to discuss the matter because the Minister was good enough to review the regulations in a statement he

made to the "West Australian" newspaper a few days ago, previous to his having tabled them. The council contends, and I agree with it, that the regulations constitute an infringement of religious liberty. They are not necessary so far as the working of the department is concerned.

The Minister for the North West: What said they are not?

Mr. NEEDHAM: What is more, unless there have been developments in the past few months, no other State in Australia has regulations of this description governing churches and religious organisations. The conference of aboriginal authorities held at Canberra discussed the old regulations and I presume the members of that conference will have some comment to make on the new ones I am now discussing. I make no reflection on the regulations generally, and want to emphasise the point that the public mind has been much more easy in regard to the administration of the department since the present Minister has been in charge, because of his well-known experience of the natives and their customs. But there is dissatisfaction concerning the particular regulations I have quoted, and that is the reason I have moved for their disallowance.

On motion by the Minister for the North West, debate adjourned.

### BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Contraceptives.
- 2, Plant Diseases Act Amendment.  
Transmitted to the Council.

### BILL—LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of the Committee adopted.

### MOTION—METROPOLITAN MILK ACT

*To Disallow Regulations.*

Debate resumed from the 30th August on the following motion by Mrs. Cardew Oliver (Subiaco):—

That Regulations 102-105 and the new Sixth Schedule under the Metropolitan Milk Act, 1932-1936, as published in the "Government Gazette" of the 9th June, 1939, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 10th August, 1939, be and are hereby disallowed.

**MR. CROSS** (Canning) [4.47]: I was very interested in the remarks of the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver), and surprised at the attitude she adopted.

**Mr. Warner**: Naturally you would be.

**Mr. CROSS**: If the hon. member is not, he verges at least on disloyalty to his own State.

**Mr. Thorn**: You have no right to make that remark.

**Mr. Raphael**: Does that come under the War Precautions Act?

**Mr. SPEAKER**: Order!

**Mr. CROSS**: One striking statement was made by the hon. member with which I intend to deal. The statement, of which I made a note at the time and which I am certain members opposite will be very interested to hear—

**Mr. Thorn**: You read it in "Hansard"; that is where you got it.

**Mr. Warner**: He made it up himself.

**Mr. SPEAKER**: Order!

**Mr. CROSS**: What the hon. member said was disloyal. She said that "at present Eastern States tinned milk is much superior in quality to anything obtainable in Western Australia."

**Mr. Warner**: Are you still on tinned milk?

**Mrs. Cardell-Oliver**: Who made that statement?

**Mr. CROSS**: The member for Subiaco.

**Mrs. Cardell-Oliver**: She is always right.

**Mr. CROSS**: And in making the statement she verged on disloyalty to the industry in this State.

**Mr. Warner**: Do not go into hysterics over it.

**Mr. CROSS**: It ill-becomes any member of this Chamber to make a comparison of that kind.

**Mr. Warner**: Tinned milk would not hurt you so long as the tin was outside the milk.

**Mr. CROSS**: As a matter of fact, thousands of cases of tinned milk are exported from Western Australia to the Eastern States every month. How does the member for Subiaco know? She does not know. Has she had samples of tinned milk analysed?

**Mr. Thorn**: How do you know?

**Mr. CROSS**: Has she ascertained by analysis the quality of Western Australian milk and Eastern States milk? The hon. member told us that the greater portion

of the milk used in her household was Sunshine powdered milk from the Eastern States.

**Mrs. Cardell-Oliver**: I did not say that.

**Mr. CROSS**: I am not permitted to quote "Hansard," but members can read it for themselves. I for one strongly resent the action of any member in making such discreditable remarks against a Western Australian industry. Those remarks are probably as reliable as most of the other statements made by her.

**Mr. Sampson**: Why not debate the motion?

**Mr. SPEAKER**: Order!

**Mr. CROSS**: The hon. member made other statements. She told us that the three members of the Melbourne Milk Board were not interested in the production of milk or in the retail side of the business, but were interested only in the welfare of the community as a whole.

**Mr. Warner**: Did the member for Subiaco say that?

**Mr. CROSS**: Had the hon. member listened, he would have heard the statement.

**Mr. Warner**: I think you copied that.

**Mr. CROSS**: The hon. member may read it in "Hansard."

**Mr. Warner**: That is where you got it.

**Mr. CROSS**: On the statement of the member for Subiaco the members of the Melbourne Milk Board are interested in the welfare of the community. Yet not one member of the Melbourne board has been known to advocate two deliveries a day; they are satisfied with the present system.

**Mrs. Cardell-Oliver**: Who told you so?

**Mr. CROSS**: The hon. member proceeded to tell us that not many hot days were experienced in Melbourne. Anyone who knows the climate in Melbourne is aware that during the short summer the weather is most humid and sultry—conditions that are inimical to the preservation of milk.

Several members interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER**: Order!

**Mr. CROSS**: The hon. member said we should have doctors as members of the Milk Board, but she did not tell us why.

**Mr. Thorn**: We shall have to get a doctor for you presently.

**Mr. CROSS**: Doctors are notoriously poor business men; they cannot even look after their own affairs.

**Mrs. Cardell-Oliver**: But they are good medical men.

Mr. CROSS: I have nothing to say about their medical ability, but I think doctors become too engrossed in their work. Often they forget to send out bills for fees due to them.

Mr. Patrick: You are lucky if you have found a doctor of that sort.

The Minister for Health: Tell me a doctor who forgets to send his accounts.

Mr. CROSS: I propose to quote figures to show that there is very little demand for a double delivery of milk daily in the greater metropolitan area. I shall give the figures of dairymen in the Canning electorate, which probably has the largest number of dairymen of any district in the greater metropolitan area. My friend Paddy Burke, of Canning Vale, delivers 70 gallons of milk a day. He makes one delivery a day, has never made more, and has never had any demand for a second delivery. A somewhat larger producer who delivers hundreds of gallons of milk a day—incidentally he delivers 117 gallons daily in the Subiaco electorate—is C. W. Treasure, of Cannington.

Mr. Warner: How many cows has he?

Mr. CROSS: A lot.

The Minister for Agriculture: And a good herd, too.

Mr. CROSS: He has one of the best herds in the State and the milk supplied is of good quality. He informs me that he has never had one request from the Subiaco district for a second delivery a day.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: He supports me because his milk is good.

Mr. CROSS: Another vendor E. F. Browne, of Cannington, delivers 53 gallons a day and makes only one delivery.

Mr. Warner: Of course you are not advertising!

Mr. CROSS: Another from the Victoria Park district, R. M. Mounsey, a man I have known for 35 years, delivers 375 gallons a day in Victoria Park. He delivers twice a day and says that less than five per cent. is delivered in the afternoon.

Mr. Hughes: I should like to know how he obtained a license for such a large quota.

Mr. Warner: Perhaps it shows how much water he uses.

Mr. CROSS: F. J. Roberts supplies 240 gallons daily to about 1,000 customers in South Perth.

Mr. Warner: Is that the owner of the racehorses?

Mr. CROSS: No, this man devotes all his time to the milk business. He is regarded not only by the Milk Board, but also by all who know him as one of the best dairymen. He is certainly an example to others, and I do not say that merely because he lives in South Perth. Mr. Roberts has delivered in South Perth for 27 years, and for seven months of the year—April to October inclusive—has made one delivery a day, and there have been no complaints. In the other five months he has delivered twice daily excepting on Wednesdays and Sundays. Mr. Roberts is a very obliging man, and if a customer wants milk twice daily, he can have it, but no request has been made for a second delivery. Mr. Roberts supplies milk in sealed bottles specially for babies; he delivers about 100 bottles a day.

Mr. Thorn: From the same cows?

Mr. CROSS: In a notice to customers, he offers to deliver this milk twice or thrice daily if required. Yet he has not had one request for a second delivery.

Mr. Thorn: Who prepared your notes?

Mr. CROSS: Mr. Roberts has taken the trouble to have every customer interviewed and he says that of his thousand customers only six desired a second delivery.

Mr. Warner: To make the inquiry must have taken much time?

Mr. CROSS: He employs a fair sized staff and the men made the inquiries in the course of their work. Mr. Roberts set out to meet the requirements of the public.

Mr. Warner: I thought the men were fully employed on the work of delivery.

Mr. CROSS: I wish to break down another of the arguments of the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver). She said the milk might be 70 hours old when used by the customer. Let me take the present-day procedure. Very soon after the cows in the metropolitan area are milked, the milk is chilled to a temperature below 40 degrees Fahrenheit. Some years ago a select committee was appointed to inquire into the milk question. The investigation showed that provided milk was chilled to 40 degrees—this is being done—there could be no growth of bacteria, and in such circumstances there could be no deterioration in the quality of the commodity. I understand that information is available in the records of this Chamber to prove that no deterioration was found, on analysis, to have taken place in the milk. When the

milk is chilled as I have described, it makes little difference whether it is delivered two hours after the cows are milked or 20 hours after, seeing that its quality remains the same.

Mr. Thorn: Who prepared your notes?

Mr. CROSS: I am able to prepare my own, unlike the hon. member who has to get someone else to do his.

Mr. Thorn: Someone on the Milk Board prepared those notes.

Mr. CROSS: Nothing of the kind. I have not interviewed a member of the board for a couple of years. Reference was also made to the proclamation of the regulations. In another place a member asserted that the whole question rested with the Arbitration Court. Men delivering milk in the greater metropolitan area are doing so under conditions laid down by the court award. That document not only lays down the rate of wages to be paid but prescribes the number of hours to be worked. It provides that the employees shall work 46 hours in a week of seven days, at the rate of 6½ hours per day. Incidentally, they can make their deliveries over nine-hour periods. The employers do not mind whether the men call twice at a house during the 6½ hours (either morning or afternoon), or whether they cover the whole ground in the one period. Mr. Roberts has pointed out that scarcely anyone wants a second delivery.

Mr. Warner: He is some man!

Mr. CROSS: He is a good man.

Mr. Warner: How does the Arbitration Court come into this?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Mt. Marshall to keep order.

Mr. CROSS: The wages and hours prescribed in the award are being observed. The Milk Board has nothing to do with the hours worked by the men. It does not signify what hours the board prescribes. Milk is being delivered according to the regulations now in force and according to the award. It can be delivered either once daily or twice a day.

Mr. Warner: What is your view?

Mr. CROSS: The employers have found so few people who require milk delivered twice a day that they consider it not worth while catering for so small a percentage of their customers. They also point out that should a family anywhere in the greater metropolitan area run short of milk, someone

in the house can obtain an extra supply from a near-by shop. I wish to draw attention to one or two phases of the retail section of the industry. That does not appear to have been dealt with in another place during the debate on this subject. Some 27 years ago those who delivered milk in the greater metropolitan area were paid 7s. a day, working eight hours a day for seven days a week.

Mr. Warner: Who told you that?

Mr. CROSS: I have seen the books of one employer who paid those wages, and I know the statement is correct.

Mr. Warner: Then it must be true.

Mr. CROSS: At that time milk was sold at 3½d. a pint. To-day the same employer is paying his men 16s. a day for working 6½ hours a day, and the price of milk is still 3½d. a pint. The dairymen know their own business best. In the metropolitan area it has been proved that for the most part people do not require a second delivery of milk. So few are they in number as to become a negligible quantity. Last week the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) said that bottled milk cost more in Sydney than did milk delivered otherwise, the price being 9d. a bottle. In Perth also, bottled milk costs more; that is only natural. When a dairyman supplies milk in bottles, even though many customers may clean their own bottles, he finds it necessary—to ensure the delivery of wholesome milk—to scour the bottles on his own premises.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Are the bottles not cleaned here, and is not the price of the milk contained in them 7d. a quart?

Mr. CROSS: The hon. member will find upon inquiry that, when milk is supplied in bottles in this State, an extra price is charged.

Mr. Warner: How would you like a bottle of it now?

Mr. CROSS: In my district, bottled milk costs more than milk delivered in another way. That appertains throughout the metropolitan area. The dairymen have to pay not only for the cleansing process, but have to replace broken bottles. Milk thus delivered must cost more than that delivered in the ordinary way. A canvass was recently made of the householders, numbering about 100, residing in three streets in my electorate. It was found that not 3 per cent. of the people had ever taken milk twice a day. They

said they did not desire it. The mothers of babies have declared that they receive special milk for their little ones. They do exactly what they are told to do by the infant health centre, and take every care of the milk. They want it delivered in the morning only. I have told members of the experience of the dairyman who has been in business for more than 20 years. He has been supplying a special milk for babies, and has had no requests for a second delivery. The gentleman to whom I refer has supplied practically all the mothers in South Perth. His knowledge and experience have proved most valuable. He has rendered a service to the public, and believes in doing so. Of what use is it to institute a double service daily when that is not required by the people concerned? I agree with the regulations. I consider them sound and fair. I hold that the provision for one delivery per day meets the requirements of the public. Consequently I oppose the motion.

**MR. NEEDHAM** (Perth) [5.11]: I have no hesitation at all in opposing the motion of the member for Subiaco to disallow these regulations. I am surprised that so much agitation is taking place with a view to disallowing regulations which to my mind are of a most humane nature, and to trying to make it appear that those who oppose the disallowance are people without any regard for the health of children. The basis of the hon. member's argument was a plentiful supply of milk for children, and especially for the children of poorer parents. I yield to no one in my advocacy of pure milk, and not only for children but also for adults. Like the Minister for Health, I was given a lot of milk when I was a child. However, it did not cause me to grow very tall. Apart from that aspect, I realise the benefit of a plentiful supply of pure milk. In my opinion disallowance of these regulations will not prevent that plentiful supply. The regulations have been brought in at the request of the retailers who supply the milk to the people, at the request of the producers who produce the milk, and also at the request of the men who deliver the milk, whether by motor car or motor truck or ordinary horse and cart. I have yet to learn that there has been any clamour from the industrial suburbs of the metropolitan area for the disallowance of the regulations.

Speaking last night with a retailer who has 600 customers on his books—moreover, in an industrial centre—I was informed that he had taken the trouble to make a canvass of his customers to discover how many of them desired disallowance of the regulations and an afternoon supply of milk. Out of those 600 customers, only six desired an afternoon supply.

**Mrs. Cardell-Oliver**: If those six customers have children, do not you think they would deserve consideration?

**Mr. NEEDHAM**: Every man and woman and child in the world is worthy of consideration. I would remind my hon. friend that she has now been for some time a legislator and that therefore she should realise that we cannot provide for the convenience of everybody; that in connection with most legislation, somebody must suffer. Let me answer her question, "Do not those six people require consideration?" by telling her that the men who distribute the milk to those six persons require consideration also.

**Mrs. Cardell-Oliver**: Yes, but they are not babies.

**Mr. NEEDHAM**: No; but they are human beings.

**Mrs. Cardell-Oliver**: But not children.

**Mr. NEEDHAM**: Babies do not suffer because of the fact that these regulations permit the men who distribute milk to have a little more leisure than they have been getting.

**Mrs. Cardell-Oliver**: That is not the point.

**Mr. Lambert**: Do I not understand that hundreds of gallons of milk are thrown away?

**Mr. SPEAKER**: Order!

**Mr. NEEDHAM**: If I had an enemy in this world at all, I think I would condemn him to become a distributor of milk. I could not wish him a worse fate.

**Mrs. Cardell-Oliver**: A worse fate would be to put him on sustenance.

**Mr. NEEDHAM**: "Sustenance!" The parrot cry of my hon. friend. I care not what subject is being discussed in this Assembly, from my hon. friend there comes the parrot cry of "sustenance." We are discussing not sustenance but the hon. member's motion, and I tell her quite frankly that whilst the child must be considered, so must the adult. In opposing her motion for disallowance of the regulations I am thinking of the father of the child as well as the child.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: The father has a vote, but the child has not.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Yes; he has a vote.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: That is the point.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Again my hon. friend is suggesting the vote. Like herself I am sent here by the votes of the people; and so far I have always had the courage to express my opinion on any question before the Chair, irrespective of votes. Let me, if I can, discuss this motion without sordid suggestions of votes being made by my hon. friend.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Not by me.

Mr. NEEDHAM: I mentioned that if I had an enemy I would condemn him to the fate of being a distributor of milk. The distributor of milk is at work all the time. He has no social life whatever. We know at what hours the distributors come into our homes, and the hours they work, night and day. Surely if these men can be relieved of some of the misery which is caused by such long hours, we are doing them good by relieving them and this without injuring anyone else. Milk producers and retailers and their employees, including distributors, are heartily in favour of the regulations.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Some of them are.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Well, some of them.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: And some are not.

Mr. NEEDHAM: In all these cases there are dissentients. It is not possible in every case to cater for the minority.

Mr. Fox: There are "narks" everywhere.

Mr. J. Hegney: There are "narks" in Heaven.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Prior to the introduction of these regulations, milk distribution in the metropolitan area was most haphazard. Milk, as I said, was delivered at all hours of the day and night. We have heard something in this connection about the other States. May I refer, for the information of the member for Subiaco, to the position obtaining in New South Wales and Victoria. In the cities of Sydney and Melbourne there are milk boards. Western Australia is not the only State which has established a milk board. Judging from discussions in this Chamber, one might sometimes feel inclined to think that our milk board was a curse. I hold the opinion that milk boards are a blessing.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: The retailers will not love you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NEEDHAM: I am endeavouring to deal with facts, apart from love or sentiment. In Sydney the hours for distribution of milk are from 3.45 to 8.30 a.m.; 12 noon to 5 p.m., and from 3.45 to 9 a.m. on Sundays and public holidays. Deliveries may be made by dairymen-vendors between 12 noon and 3.30 p.m. but very few are so made. In Melbourne the hours are from 1 a.m. to 9 a.m., except in the city proper, where the deliveries are from 1 a.m. to 12 noon. I do not know whether Dr. Stang has inquired regarding the health of the children in Sydney or Melbourne.

Mr. Lambert: Or in Colombo.

Mr. NEEDHAM: I suggest that the children of Sydney and Melbourne are just as healthy as those to be seen in Perth.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: They are healthier in those centres, according to Dr. Stang's report.

Mr. NEEDHAM: There is no evidence at all of that.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: There is a difference in the climate.

The Minister for Health: The hon. member never made that comparison.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NEEDHAM: Under the old system, the quantity of milk delivered in the afternoon was negligible as compared with the morning's supplies. That is a feature that must be remembered.

Mr. Lambert: Most of the women would be out shopping in the afternoon.

Mr. NEEDHAM: The more we inquire into this subject, the more we appreciate that there is nothing at all in the contention advanced by the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) that the health of the children will be adversely affected because of the new regulations. Many vendors made no deliveries in the afternoon even when the old regulations operated, and those that did deliver in the afternoons did not do so on Wednesdays and Sundays or on Saturdays and Sundays.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: That does not make it right.

Mr. NEEDHAM: No, but the hon. member referred to the position in Sydney and remarked upon the difference between the climate there and in Perth. I suggest to her that the climate of Sydney is much more humid than elsewhere in the

Commonwealth. Our most humid day in Perth cannot compare with any humid day in Sydney. Branching off from that aspect, and still having relation to the question of climate, will the member for Subiaco suggest that we can specially arrange the weather for Saturdays, Sundays or Wednesdays?

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: No.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Were there not hot Sunday, Wednesday and Saturday afternoons during which, under the old regulations, there were no afternoon deliveries of milk?

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Under the old system we could have two or three deliveries, and get milk when we desired it.

Mr. NEEDHAM: I have pointed out to the hon. member that she could not get milk delivered under the old conditions on certain afternoons. I have pointed out that in some places where she does not live—I am speaking of suburbs where I have lived, or know the conditions best—she could not have milk delivered, nor could she get supplies, unless she went to a shop and made her purchase there. The hon. member knows most about Nedlands, Peppermint Grove, Claremont and—

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Subiaco, if you please.

Mr. NEEDHAM: That is the suburb the hon. member represents in this House.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: And I live there.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Exactly. But I suggest the hon. member knows much more about the conditions that obtain in the suburbs I mentioned, which are not industrial centres.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Under the old regulations the hon. member could not have milk delivered in the afternoon.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: That was the fault of legislators. The people should have been able to obtain deliveries of milk in the afternoon.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Unquestionably, the member for Subiaco based the whole of her contentions on the health of the child. When she replies to the debate, which no doubt she will do in her inimitable and able manner, I want her to prove that the health of children is endangered because of no afternoon deliveries of milk. Prior to the introduction of the present regulations, no afternoon deliveries were made in Fremantle over a period of

many years. I refer to the members representing Fremantle constituencies for confirmation of my statement. Fine specimens of children may be seen in the Fremantle districts, and I ask the member for Subiaco whether the children of Fremantle compare unfavourably with those to be found in Peppermint Grove, Claremont, Nedlands, or even Subiaco, despite the fact that for many years past milk has not been delivered in the afternoon throughout the Fremantle area.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: But Dr. Stang says—

Mr. NEEDHAM: Oh, Dr. Stang! We shall hear a lot more about her.

Mr. Fox: At any rate, both the Fremantle football teams are in the final four this season.

Mr. NEEDHAM: I intend neither to praise nor to condemn Dr. Stang, who is not here to defend herself. I desire to leave her out of any criticism I may voice. I have been in Western Australia for many years and my experience goes to prove that the people living in industrial suburbs are satisfied to have morning deliveries of milk. I have become just as familiar with the conditions in most of the metropolitan suburbs as are other members, and I confess that since the new regulations were gazetted I have not heard one word of complaint about their application. The request for an afternoon delivery, so far as I have been able to gather, has come, for the most part, from residents of Peppermint Grove or somewhere in that vicinity. I do not think there are too many industrial establishments in that part of the metropolitan area. The old delivery system, as I have already mentioned, imposed great hardships on milk carters, who were able to enjoy only broken periods of rest. Surely it is necessary that some consideration be shown for the interests of those men, particularly when that consideration will result in no injury to the health of others. The member for Subiaco is an experienced business woman, and if she were in the milk business she would quickly appreciate the fact that afternoon deliveries would not pay. Overhead costs are increased and afternoon deliveries become most expensive. Retailers who delivered milk twice daily had to travel the same distance in the afternoon as was covered for the morning delivery.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: That is not the point.

Mr. NEEDHAM: No, not the point that the hon. member has in view, but I am reminding her that it is an aspect to be considered. This problem has its economic side. I assure her that if she were engaged in the milk business, she would certainly consider the economic phase in relation to overhead expenses. Not only do the carters have to travel the same distance in the afternoon as in the morning, but they have to do so for the purpose of delivering not more than from 5 to 10 per cent. of their ordinary morning supplies. More often the quantity represents 5 per cent. than 10 per cent. Again, not only is the afternoon delivery expensive and the volume to be delivered only 5 per cent. of the morning supply, but very often the milkman's afternoon call is in vain because when he knocks at the door, no one is at home. So his work and labour have gone for nothing. Again, climatic conditions enter into the question because the delivery of milk in the metropolitan area during the heat of the day in summer time is bad. Despite endeavours to keep milk cool by encasing it in canvas bags, we are aware that the hot easterly winds dry the bags very quickly. Then the milk becomes heated and we know that heat on milk has a deleterious effect. Thus again the question of health comes in. When milk is delivered in such circumstances we can rest assured it cannot remain in anything like good condition and so cannot be given to children, or adults either. It has been contended by those who are opposing the motion and are in favour of the retention of the regulations, that milk delivered to consumers in the morning and kept in a cool place is better than the milk delivered to consumers after it has been moved about during the heat of the day. I do not know whether the member for Subiaco has made inquiries about the milk so delivered. If she has done so, she must know that it is then of exceptionally good quality. The milk supplied in Perth compares more than favourably with that supplied to consumers in the Eastern capitals. We know that there is no hardship imposed on the consumer who has neither an ice chest nor a refrigerator. The hon. member suggested that if the poorer people did not get milk delivered in the afternoon, their health and that of their children would suffer because they were not able to afford a refrigerator or an ice chest. I agree with her that the workers, especially those on the

basic wage, cannot afford the luxury of either an ice chest or a refrigerator; but the worker can afford something just as good in which to keep the milk cool, and prevent it from getting into that state that it becomes unfit for human consumption. Milk can be kept in a Coolgardie safe, which can always be suspended in a cool place or wherever there may be a breeze. Alternatively, milk can be boiled and then it will keep for a longer period. My children have consumed milk in the ordinary way and they are healthy.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: But you have plenty of money.

Mr. NEEDHAM: The question of money does not enter into it at all; and so I treat that interjection with the supreme contempt it deserves. So far as I am aware the Milk Board has not received any objections to the regulations from the industrial section of the community. Objections have come primarily from the member for Subiaco and from members of local government associations, and those objections have been fostered and inspired. I support the regulations and oppose the hon. member's motion for their disallowance. I hope the House will refuse to agree to the motion and I am confident that if the regulations are permitted to remain in force the consumers will continue to be just as healthy as they have ever been.

MR. FOX (South Fremantle) [5.35]: I too intend to oppose the disallowance of the regulations mostly on the same grounds as have been advanced by the two previous speakers. I endorse the remarks of the member for Canning (Mr. Cross) who expressed disapproval of the anti-Western Australian statements of the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) in running down a local product and boosting a product from the Eastern States. The hon. member's attitude is most unfortunate, particularly at a time like the present when the Minister for Industrial Development is endeavouring to establish new industries in the State and giving every encouragement to those that are already in existence. More particularly are the hon. member's remarks unfortunate seeing that she is one of our legislators.

Mr. Hughes: Where did you get the material for your suit?

Mr. FOX: I always patronise Western Australian products. However, I have no wish to be side tracked because what the hon. member suggests has nothing to do with the matter under discussion. The member for Subiaco also stated that the milk vendor to receive encouragement should be the person who supplies what is known as "one cow's milk." I have discussed that aspect with a dairyman who has been in business at Fremantle for over 35 years and he said that there is no such thing as one cow's milk, and that if such were supplied, in many cases the result would be injurious to the consumer, particularly a child. He declared that it was better to have the milk mixed and he added that that was always done. I call to mind something that was done by a man who was delivering milk in Melbourne. He had a special blue label for the one-cow milk that was to be delivered for children. If he ran short of one-cow milk, he had a supply of blue labels with him, and stuck some of them on other bottles. The customers were certainly under the impression they were getting one-cow milk, but it did not seem to make any difference. The member for Subiaco said that Dr. Dale—who is at present in Melbourne—had stated it would be necessary for consumers to have a refrigerator or ice-chest in order to keep milk wholesome. In my opinion, an ice-chest is about the worst place in which to keep milk. I was on the eastern goldfields some 25 or 30 years ago. I lived 30 miles from a railway and we had one delivery of milk a day. Nearly all the residents of the district were young married people, most of whom had one or two children. They experienced no difficulty in keeping milk fresh in the way described by the member for Perth (Mr. Needham). Each resident had a Coolgardie safe, constructed of a framework covered with hessian. Water was not as plentiful in the district as it is in Perth. We had to catch all water for drinking purposes from the rain that fell during the year. A dam had been constructed with a capacity of about 3,000,000 gallons, and the water from it was used for washing, and so forth. We were adversely situated so far as keeping milk was concerned, yet not one child died there during the whole of the time I resided in the district. The temperature ranged as high as 112 to 118 degrees in the shade. On very many days during the summer, it was well

over 100 degrees, yet the mothers had no difficulty in rearing their children.

I know that the member for Subiaco went to much trouble in preparing her case for the disallowance of these regulations. One would think, however, that she would have given some mortality figures to prove the discontinuance of the second delivery was harmful to children. In Fremantle there has been only one delivery of milk per day since 1911. I took the trouble to obtain figures of the mortality of infants for the two years preceding the period when one delivery was made and the two following years. There is very little difference in the figures. In 1909-10, excluding still-born children, the number of deaths was 99. In the period 1912-13, the number was 93, so there was a reduction in the latter period when only one delivery was made. I am not maintaining that one delivery is better than two in this respect, but the mortality figures show little difference. The number of children who died under the age of one month in 1909-10 was 31; in 1912-13 it was 27. The number of children who died under the age of two years would not, I think, be greater after the one delivery than it was when two deliveries were made.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Wages have altered and conditions have changed.

Mr. FOX: If every person in Western Australia were in receipt of the basic wage, I believe it would not matter whether they had milk or not. I know families in the Fremantle district who are as good a type as can be seen anywhere. In fact, they would take first prize if they entered in an exhibition, and yet they do not consume milk at all. I myself drank very little milk when I was young, although I lived in a farming district. It was not customary for the people there to drink much milk. I had an abundant supply of vegetables.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: How did you get on when you were a baby?

Mr. FOX: I do not remember. I seem to have got on fairly well, however, because I did not cost my parents much for medical attention. In fact, I have enjoyed good health throughout my life. I have discussed the regulations with doctors, who inform me that young children in the Fremantle district are under no disability whatever because of milk being delivered only once daily.

I will now deal with the conditions under which people delivering milk worked previous to 1906, when two deliveries daily were made. Those men worked 365 days a year—seven days a week. They had no holidays, unless they met with an accident or were ill, and one could hardly call time off under such conditions a holiday. They were out in all kinds of weather; they ran the risk of falling over electric wires that had come down; and they had to put up with many hardships. Recently I read letters in the newspapers from people complaining that they had been disturbed by milk-carters in the early hours of the morning. Those people ought to be thankful that they do not have to rise at 4 o'clock in the morning.

Member: One o'clock.

Mr. FOX: Or at one, two or three o'clock in the morning to deliver milk. They ought to be grateful that they can lie in bed while the rain is pelting down, and should sympathise with the milkman who has to rise so early in order that his customers may have fresh milk for breakfast. Between the years 1906 and 1909, there was an agitation in Fremantle to give the milkmen Sunday afternoon off. What happened then is happening now. Vigorous protests came from such people as the member for Subiaco. They said they could not do without the second delivery of milk on Sunday. However, the proposal was given a trial. The problem then arose as to what should be done with the milk that ordinarily was delivered on the Sunday afternoon. It was decided to store it in the freezing chamber at the ice works. The milk was frozen into a solid block, left there and delivered the following Saturday, so it was a week old when it was delivered.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Most dishonest.

Mr. FOX: At all events, that is true, whether it be dishonest or not. I got the information from a dairyman who was in the industry at the time and still is. Shortly afterwards, it was deemed advisable to give the men another half-day off. There was the same opposition. However, the men got Wednesday afternoon off. Wednesday afternoon's milk was then treated in the same way as the Sunday afternoon's milk was treated. It was put into a freezer, and delivered three days afterwards. Sunday afternoon's milk was sold on Wednesday, and Wednesday afternoon's milk on the fol-

lowing Sunday. That is how the difficulty was overcome. In 1911, it was decided that the men should get one day a week off.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Why work at all?

Mr. FOX: It must be remembered that at that time the same facilities were not available for cooling milk as exist to-day. The custom then was to put the milk in cans, and place in the cans tubes about 18 inches long and six inches wide, into which ice was packed. The milk was kept in the cans in this way until the following morning. The carters would begin to deliver the milk very early in the morning. In those days the vendors were mostly producer-retailers. The carters would go out the following morning with the previous night's milk. Then, after the morning milking had been done the producers would meet the carters somewhere in the district and deliver to them the rest of the milk. I would like to see one delivery a day continued in order that milkmen might be assured of more comfortable conditions. At present they are social outcasts. They go to bed in the afternoon and have to be up between 1.30 a.m. and 2 a.m. so that they have no social life whatever. It is nearly time that one delivery a day was given a fair trial throughout the metropolitan area. Therefore I hope the House will, by a large majority, refuse to disallow the regulations.

MR. McLARTY (Murray-Wellington) [5.51]: My speech on this matter will be brief, but I feel that I should say something as I represent a large body of producers. I have consulted a number of the producers in my district and they appear to be offering no objection. Not one producer with whom I have discussed the matter has opposed the regulations. At the same time I cannot say that they are particularly keen about them. They do feel that the Milk Board is responsible for the sale and distribution of milk, and consequently should not be embarrassed. I should like the Minister in his reply—

The Minister for Agriculture: I have not the right of reply.

Mr. McLARTY: That is so, but the Minister will probably speak, and I would like him to give us an assurance when he does reply—

Mr. Thorn: He will not be replying.

Mr. McLARTY: I should like him when he speaks to give us an assurance that if

the regulations prove to be responsible for a reduction in the consumption of milk he will have them withdrawn.

The Minister for Agriculture: I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. McLARTY: I am very glad to hear the Minister say that.

Mr. Seward: It will be too late then.

Mr. J. Hegney: I understood that the producers approved of the regulations.

Mr. McLARTY: The producers are adopting a trustful attitude towards the board in this matter. I was somewhat alarmed in reading a speech made by the Honorary Minister in another place to note that he said the disallowance of the regulations would strike a vital blow at the Act.

Mr. Thorn: He was only bluffing.

Mr. McLARTY: I am not prepared to say that he was bluffing.

The Minister for Health: He never does that.

Mr. McLARTY: I feel that if a vital blow is struck at the Metropolitan Milk Act the position of producers engaged in the industry will be, to say the least of it, very serious indeed. I would not take the risk of doing anything that might have the effect of bringing the producers back to the standard that existed before the board came into being. They were exploited; there is no question about that. I do not know of any other section of the community that is more easily exploited than those producing whole milk.

Mr. Thorn: The Honorary Minister was threatening them.

Mr. McLARTY: I do not suggest that the Honorary Minister was threatening the producers but he did say that a vital blow would be struck at this particular Act if the regulations were disallowed.

Mr. Thorn: Well, that is a threat.

Mr. Rodoreda: It is a fact; not a threat.

Mr. McLARTY: I do not want any vital blow to be struck at the Act. The member for Perth (Mr. Needham) went to some pains to explain the conditions under which the retailers work. I would also like to inform the House, though I daresay members already know, that the producers themselves work long hours. They work for seven days a week, and many of them are social outcasts just as the hon. member said the distributors were. The regulations have been framed with the idea

of reducing the cost of the distribution of milk. Who is to get the benefit of that reduction? Are the reduced costs to help the retailers, or is every section of the industry to receive some benefit? Are the producers to derive any advantage from the decreased cost? I think that members are aware that the producer is supposed to receive 1s. 4d. a gallon for his milk. Many consumers believe that he actually does receive that amount, whereas in fact he gets nothing of the kind. Indeed he obtains considerably less. The return to some producers is very much below 1s. 4d.

Mr. Rodoreda: How is that?

Mr. McLARTY: The cost of transport, spillage, and the fees due to the board, as well as other costs, reduce the amount below the 1s. 4d. fixed by the board.

Mr. Hughes: Every producer and manufacturer has to bear transport costs.

Mr. McLARTY: I am aware that transport costs have to be met.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is quite a legitimate charge.

Mr. McLARTY: What I am trying to point out is that the producer is not getting 1s. 4d., but considerably less. The consumer pays 2s. 4d. per gallon for his milk—and in some cases more than that—as against the 1s. 4d. which the producer receives. The spread is far too great. The fact has been pointed out to this House many times. My view is that in the event of a reduction in the cost of distribution the producers should benefit from it.

Mr. Fox: What about nationalising the industry?

Mr. McLARTY: Of course the hon. member is now discussing one of his pet subjects and it is a subject upon which he and I disagree.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is getting away from the motion, too, I think.

Mr. McLARTY: I do not propose to discuss the ramifications of the Metropolitan Milk Act. The whole question will be debated by the House shortly. All I am concerned about at present is the single delivery. We have been told that such delivery is the custom in cities like Melbourne, Sydney and Fremantle, and, I think even in Kalgoorlie. If the system is successful in those places I do not see why it should not function just as successfully in the metropolitan area. Milk can still be ob

tained from the shops. I think the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) is unduly worried about a possible shortage of milk. Again, the chairman of the Milk Board told us that only 5 per cent., or at the most 10 per cent. of the milk consumed has in the past been delivered in the afternoon. I do not think there should be much difficulty in arranging for the 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. to be delivered in the morning, leaving consumers to obtain other supplies that might be required from the shops. I was astounded to hear the member for Subiaco say that milk was being thrown away in the metropolitan-suburban area. I cannot understand the reason for such waste. Many people—poultry farmers and others—would be quite willing to buy the milk, and there are few men who would throw milk away at a time when butter fat is returning such a payable price. The hon. member might have seen somebody throw some milk away, but I think it was misleading to suggest that milk is thrown away in any quantity.

The Minister for Health: Is it not just a common expression?

Mr. McLARTY: I should not like the Minister or anyone else to depend upon the quantity of milk thrown away in the metropolitan-suburban area because I think we would be sadly disappointed. I support the regulations, but if in future they prove to be responsible for a decrease in the quantity of milk consumed, I shall do my best to have them withdrawn. I hope the Minister will agree to the adoption of that course.

### THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne) [6.2] : This motion, although not party-contentious, appears to be personally-contentious, and notwithstanding that it has given rise to some heat, I hope that I shall be able, while dealing with the subject fully and discussing seriatim the arguments submitted by the member for Subiaco, to handle it calmly and dispassionately, although not disinterestedly, being charged with the administrative responsibility, and to answer every point raised by the hon. member. To many people any sort of regulation is irksome. Whether it applies to them or affects them, here is a natural objection to any form of control. Most of the people who are opposing these regulations are doing so, not on the case they are able to present, but because of hostility to the Milk Board. Un-

fortunately, I was not present when the member for Subiaco spoke in support of the motion, but I have carefully read the report of her speech and the comments published in the newspaper at the time, and am certain that no real reason has yet been advanced for the disallowance of the regulations.

The first objection by the hon. member was raised on behalf of the producer. Plans were advanced that ultimately the regulations would operate detrimentally to the producer. In reviewing many of the statements submitted by the hon. member and the contentions advanced regarding condensed and other prepared milk, I cannot find that her whole argument, or even much of it, was in support of or in the interests of the producer. Therefore I desire, by reading resolutions of producers' meetings, to show what the producers themselves think of the regulations. These are the people who, the hon. member contends, are being harassed by the actions of the board. On the 30th June the Milk Producers and Producer-Retailers' Association unanimously passed the following motion:—

This association approves of the regulations as gazetted by the Milk Board for one delivery of milk daily, and considers that this reform is long overdue.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Were all of them present?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot say, but all would be entitled to attend. When a meeting of this sort is convened, those interested in the matter to be discussed are informed of the time and place of the meeting and usually attend. At Ryford, in the electorate of the member for Murray-Wellington, which supplies a large quantity of milk for the outer suburban districts, a meeting of the Primary Producers' Association was held and producers from several centres were present. The following motion was carried:—

This meeting views with regret Mr. Baxter's action in moving for the disallowance of the regulations and dissociates itself from the opinions which he expressed.

I understand that the motion moved by Mr. Baxter in another place is in terms similar to that which has been moved in this House. We see that the regulations have been unanimously supported by producers in a district that is considered an

important one in the supply of wholesome milk to the city. These two organisations which strongly endorsed the action of the board, are surely well qualified to speak for the producers. The member for Subiaco alleged that the producer-retailers were having a noose tightened round their necks, and that they were made subject to all sorts of irksome regulations. That would suggest—if what the hon. member said was a fact—they would be very hostile to the regulations. In contradistinction to that attitude I have shown that the retailers wholeheartedly support the regulations. They most emphatically support them as regulations, and also support the Milk Board. At a meeting of Milk Producers and the Producer-Retailers' Association on the 30th June the following motion was unanimously passed:—

The Milk Board possesses the confidence of the association, which will utilise all its efforts to see that the board is kept in existence when the Act comes up for revision in Parliament at the end of this year.

That motion appeared in the "West Australian" as having been carried unanimously at a meeting of milk producers and the members of the Producer-Retailers Association. It is very patent that the hon. member, though ostensibly speaking on behalf of the producers, was not in fact speaking for them. To members it will also be obvious that the opinions expressed by her were not the opinions of the producers. These are the people who, it is alleged, are being harassed and dealt with as claimed by the hon. member, because they have been forced to improve their position and keep a higher grade of milking cows. I submit that if they have been forced to improve their positions and provide themselves with better beasts, that is only in their own interests and in the interests of every member of the community. No matter whether the person concerned is a producer of milk for consumption as whole milk or for utilisation in any factory in the State, or for use in any manner whatever in connection with any milk products, if by the operations of the Milk Board, by attention to hygiene, the necessity for taking every care whether of the beasts themselves or the utensils used as containers, better results are achieved, that is all in the interests of the community as a whole. The hon. member de-

clared that these people have been forced to improve conditions and keep a higher grade of milking cow. I submit there is nothing wrong with that.

The origin of these regulations has been questioned. The hon. member stated that there was some power behind the move to institute and enforce them. There is a very simple explanation and a very good reason why these regulations were issued by the board. The organisation was established by Mr. P. D. Ferguson in 1932. It was carried on until 1935 by the present Deputy Premier, and since that year has been attached to the Agricultural Department, and therefore has come under my purview. In making every effort to encourage and develop the business of milk production on right lines I have studied the interests of every section of the community. Whilst I do not desire to deal with all the ramifications and activities of the board, I wish to say that 2½ years ago I caused full inquiries to be made into the possibility of effecting improvements in the situation generally. That investigation was followed by a report not long since received from very responsible officers of the department, reviewing all the activities of the board and the milk supply system of Perth. Amongst the many important recommendations made to me was one that a once-a-day delivery might well be introduced. The board was consulted in the matter as were also all sections of the community, indeed every person who had any active association with the milk supply of Perth. The result was that regulations were framed in the best interests of the whole community, and were submitted to the House. There was, therefore, behind them no illicit power to be disregarded, as indicated by the member for Subiaco. That is the history of the introduction of these regulations. After all the facts available in this State and other States had been considered the regulations were framed and tabled.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

**The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** Prior to the tea adjournment I was dealing with the point of where the move for disallowance of these regulations came from, and was endeavouring to dispel the idea,

apparently current, that the move emanated from quarters which were questionable or unworthy, or quarters in which the subject was not understood. One of the grounds for the regulations was economy, but that was only one ground. People in a position to know something of the industry are definitely of opinion that the afternoon delivery of milk is wasteful and uneconomical. Retailers often emphasise the point that their economic position in the industry is serious; and this serious position has at all times received full consideration from the board. The member for Subiaco, in introducing the objections to the regulations, is reported to have said—

If milk turns sour, boils over or is upset, people have a right to get another delivery in the afternoon. That is the whole point.

The hon. member went on to say—

They have a right to get it, and should be able to get it; but under these regulations that right is denied them.

She further stated—

I am not saying how much they should pay for that service.

If milk turns sour, that may or may not be, most likely would not be, the fault of the milkman. That is a point I desire to deal with at some length at a later stage. However, if milk turns sour or boils over or is upset, that surely is not an adequate reason to incur the tremendous cost to the industry of an afternoon delivery. I would suggest that if my wife did not accept the responsibility in her home of seeing that the milk did not boil over or was not upset, she would not be entitled to bring a milkman, in some instances from three or four miles, to deliver a quantity for the evening, any more than that she should feel that the butcher ought to deliver an extra piece of steak if the cat got away with one.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: But he will, he does.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The whole fault in our economic structure to-day is the tremendous cost which the consumer pays for imaginary services—services actually given but needed only in the imagination—and that applies to very many other commodities besides milk. However, I say in reply to the hon. member that if people upset milk they have no right to require a second delivery, and for that reason, or for either of the other two reasons, to impose the consequent charges on the whole

body of consumers. I wish to quote another statement made by the hon. member in her introductory speech—

We know that the price of milk in the city is already too high, and that poor people cannot afford to buy the quantity they should have.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: They cannot.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Compare that with the previous statement that if the milk is upset or turns sour, the customer has a right to the afternoon service. Very well; who is to pay for that afternoon service? Not the person who actually demands it and says he requires the milk, but the whole of the consumers, including the poor people for whom the hon. member says that milk is already too dear. The way to make milk cheaper for them is definitely to support the regulations; and the way to make more milk, and of better quality, available is also to support the regulations. No one has a special claim to a special delivery on the one hand, and on the other hand to say that the cost of that special delivery shall be borne by all the other consumers, who do not want the special delivery.

So far as the handling of the future requirements of this city in all its necessities with regard to milk is concerned, these regulations represent only one step being taken, and one step being contemplated, to effect better service. The next step the board proposes to take will effect economies in the distribution of milk, amounting to very large sums; and that step is the zoning of the districts within the city and the metropolitan area. That, I claim, is co-related to this present move to such an extent as to constitute a highly important part of it. From the facts collected by the board,—facts which I intend to give to the House during this session but on another occasion—it will be shown that the tremendous cost of the overlapping in the industry is certainly a great factor in milk being the price it is to-day to the consumer.

There is another point to which I desire to refer, a quotation by the hon. member. I cannot imagine for one moment that the hon. member was guilty of a wilful mistake or a wilful mis-statement in this connection. I think, to be quite generous in the matter, that it was done unintentionally;

but still it is a highly important point. The hon. member said:—

Not one-twentieth of a pint of milk a day is consumed by the people in the metropolitan area of this State.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Per head.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, per head. If the hon. member insists that that is so, I can only be sufficiently generous to say that she is very badly informed.

Mr. Cross: She is usually wrong.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn), when that statement was made, said the quantity was not enough for the cat. The fact is that during this current year a quantity of milk approaching 5,000,000 gallons will be used in the city and metropolitan area; that is, in the area controlled by the board.

Mr. Thorn: I did not agree with the statement you quoted.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No. I was merely drawing attention to the fact that the statement had been made. Since 5,000,000 gallons of milk are likely to be consumed in this city with a population of 220,000 persons, including children at the mother's breast, including also many persons who taste milk only in tea, if they take it then—

Member: Or in whisky!

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Some in whisky. In spite of all those deductions, in spite of the many thousands of persons who do not take milk at all, the consumption of milk in the city of Perth and the metropolitan area is half a pint per day per person. Then we can view the matter on a State-wide basis. Many members of this House represent constituencies where fresh cows' milk is rarely seen. In the electorate of the Minister for Railways, I have seen children at places like Rawlinna on the Trans. line, who, if appearances go for anything, are amongst the healthiest in the State. It matters not if we view the position district by district or on a State-wide basis, the figures, in spite of the rural areas where the consumption is notoriously low—those areas are the worst from the standpoint of milk consumption—show that the consumption per head per day is approximately .45 of a pint. That figure is irrefutable. It is useless for the hon. member to persist with

her statement that the average daily consumption was not one-twentieth of a pint. Decidedly there must be a mistake in the way her figures were worked out. I have given the facts. In addition to the quantity of fresh milk consumed, a tremendous lot of treated milk is used as well. I refer to dried, skim and condensed milk, of which vast quantities are consumed throughout the State. The figures, quite apart from those relating to skim and other milk used for industrial purposes, show that the milk used for food, including fresh and treated milk, represents slightly less than one pint per head per day. I do not desire the misleading impression, which a statement such as that of the member for Subiaco would create, to gain currency abroad, because the figures I have quoted have been drawn from those engaged in the industry, from departmental sources, and from men most qualified to speak on the subject. I submit those figures without fear of challenge.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Was not a large proportion exported?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No; I shall quote figures regarding exports. I thank the hon. member for her interjection, because it brings me to a very remarkable statement attributed to her. That statement was—

A considerable quantity of tinned milk is consumed in my house. I absolutely know that at present Eastern States tinned milk is much superior in quality to any manufactured in Western Australia.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Quite true.

Mr. Cross: The hon. member should withdraw such a statement.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not think the hon. member will dispute that she used those words.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: No, I said that.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In spite of her statement that she uses Eastern States milk, I can assure her that loyalty to the Western Australian product on her part would be better for herself and for the State. I was perturbed when I read the report of her statement.

Mr. Cross: I was disgusted!

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I subsequently got in touch with the manager of Nestle's Company in Perth and made available to him the actual words attributed to the member for Subiaco. He

also was perturbed, and dispatched a telegram to the managing director of his firm in Sydney regarding the hon. member's statement concerning the quality of tinned milk produced in Western Australia, and her reference to imports. Members will appreciate the fact that what I have said represents not merely my own opinion but facts that have been verified. I have been all the more astounded to think that the member for Subiaco should have made such a statement, for she could not have been in possession of all the facts. I have a copy of the telegram received in reply from Sydney, and it read as follows:—

Concerning condensed milk manufactured Western Australia we emphatically state Western Australian manufacture equivalent to that manufactured Victoria or New South Wales. This supported by fact that we export from Western Australia to all other States of Commonwealth without single complaint. We hope still further develop our operations Western Australia as we are interested in developing dairying industry that State.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Did that refer to powdered milk?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: I referred to powdered milk. I think I mentioned the fact.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I quoted the hon. member's exact words. She said that a considerable quantity of tinned milk was consumed in her own house.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: That referred to powdered milk.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member also said, "I absolutely know that at present Eastern States tinned milk is much superior in quality to any manufactured in Western Australia."

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: What I referred to was Sunshine tinned powdered milk.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Very well. The point at issue not only involves the quality of powdered or skim milk as well as condensed milk manufactured in this State, for such an all-embracing statement covers all forms of milk production. The hon. member mentioned imports, but did not have anything to say regarding exports from Western Australia. The actual figures show that tinned milk imports for last year—I shall deal only with the one year—represented 1,229,915 lbs. valued at

£791,712, whereas the exports totalled 1,126,529 lbs. valued at £790,253. Members will see that the exports almost exactly balanced the imports. As to tinned milk generally, the provisions of the Commerce Act apply equally to all States of the Commonwealth. Our tinned milk is governed by exactly the same regulations as is that produced in the Eastern States with which we have to compete. That is borne out on analysis. We find that 4,500,000 lbs. of concentrated milk was manufactured in Western Australia last year. A very large proportion of that quantity was exported in competition with milk manufactured in the other States. Of our total production in Western Australia, nearly 98 per cent. was manufactured at Waroona in the electorate represented by the member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty). That milk was of a standard uniform with that turned out by the other factories of Nestle's throughout Australia. To quote the words of the member for Subiaco again, she said that the reason she used Eastern States milk was that it had reached a quality hitherto undreamt of, because it was of such a standard that no better milk was produced. I suggest that the hon. member would do herself and the State a good service if she reverted to the use of tinned milk manufactured in Western Australia, seeing that it is of a standard equal to that produced by Nestle's in other parts of Australia and is therefore of a "quality hitherto undreamt of" by her.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Is that powdered milk?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Both powdered and tinned. The hon. member mentioned Sunshine milk, which represents the first product of its kind marketed in Australia. For the first time the chemist and the manufacturer have succeeded in so evaporating solids and fats as to make it possible for whole milk to be presented on the market in a dried form. That achievement represented the result of 20 years of experiment and experience by the highest technicians in Australia.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: That is what I said it was.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: These milks are of equal quality whether manufactured in the Eastern States or in Western Australia. The imports of preserved dried milk demonstrate that the

hon. member's contention that we are inducing the consumption of a tremendous quantity of tinned milk was entirely without foundation. The figures relating to the importation of preserved milk from the Eastern States last year—I have the figures month by month, but I shall not weary the House by quoting all of them—show that in April last year 104,944lbs. of preserved milk were imported, while for April this year the quantity represented 15,048lbs. During May of last year the imports totalled 135,792lbs., whereas for May of this year the imports aggregated 78,554lbs. In June of last year the imports amounted to 130,000lbs.; this year they amounted to 262,000lbs. I went to the trouble of having inquiries made on my behalf from three of the largest retail grocers in Perth. I shall not mention their names, but they say no considerable increase in sales has taken place since the introduction of these regulations, but that sales of whole milk products, dried milk, are rapidly overhauling sales of skim milk. Is that not for an obvious reason? The consumption of milk or of any other food is governed by competition of price; because fresh milk might be more expensive than dried milk, people are educated to take the latter product in preference to fresh milk. One reason for the introduction of the regulations, as I have mentioned, is economy. We wish to cheapen milk. When zoning is put into effect, the price will be brought down one-halfpenny a pint in the metropolitan area. It might be brought down by more than that, but one condition is inter-related with the other. A tremendous quantity of imported powdered milk—for which we paid £69,000 last year—is used in cakes. Is it not a wholesome food, although deprived of its fat contents? The milk solids remaining are an important factor in the health of our people. The casein content itself is important. We find that cake makers and wholesale manufacturers of similar commodities are rapidly extending their purchases of skim milk and skim milk powdered. That is because they have a readily accessible product which has all the qualities of separated milk, or milk without butter fat. In the Premier's electorate large quantities of skim milk powdered are being used as a base for sprays for tomato plants. In our orchards, as the member

for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn) can confirm, large quantities of skim milk powdered are used for the reason that the casein content holds in suspension many poisonous substances used in sprays. Therefore, it cannot be alleged that because imports of milk foods are being increased, the consumption of fresh milk is being reduced. Nestle's and other manufacturers who produce large quantities of milk products for sale in milk bars, are finding that the consumption of those commodities is increasing to such an extent that they are putting their products into much larger containers. Tons of dried milk products are being purchased for use with all kinds of beverages sold at the various milk bars and cool-drink shops in the city. Therefore, it is ridiculous to assert that merely because large quantities of these products are being consumed, less whole milk is being consumed. People have a shift in consumption; they move from jam to honey, or from one product to another, according to the price of the commodity and the change in taste. I have pointed out that skim milk powdered is used in the manufacture of cakes and for domestic purposes, and it certainly has a great food value. I asked one of the officers of my department to look into that point for me this morning, and he advised me that skim milk powdered, when dissolved according to the instructions on the label, must contain 8.8 per cent. solids, not fats. He points out that 1 oz. of powdered milk contains as much fat as a pint of milk, and that the vitamin content is not destroyed by churning.

The production of infants' and children's food from skim milk has been considered by the Department of Commerce. By the regulations under the Commerce Act, as all know, the words "skim milk" on the label must be printed in 12-point letters, or three-sixteenths of an inch, so that people can readily see that it is not suited for dietetic purposes, or as a food for infants. Large quantities of the product of Nestle's factory at Waroona are being purchased by manufacturers in the Eastern States, not for any sentimental reason, not because we cannot consume it in the State, but because it has reached a quality hitherto undreamt of. That being so, I suggest that the hon. member dissociates herself from Eastern States' tinned milk and use the local product, as she can do without fear of deleterious results.

A member to-night spoke of the fallacy of the idea that one-cow milk has some particu-

lar virtue. Even admitting that analysis shows a better fat content in the milk of one cow than in the milk of another, that is not evidence that the first cow gives a better return than the other. It is entirely fallacious to assume that milk from one cow is better because of its fat content or for any other particular reason. No material benefit can be obtained by utilising the milk from one cow only.

Mr. Doney: There is not general agreement on that point, is there?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes. I will quote some authorities.

Hon. P. Collier: There are not many laymen who do not know that.

Mr. Doney: I will be interested to hear more about it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Adequate provision has been made in every suburb for the supply of milk. Except perhaps in some widely-scattered suburbs, milk can be obtained within a quarter of a mile of almost any home—good milk, the best milk. It is not the poor people for whom the member for Subiaco pleads. It is not on their behalf that the agitation has been promoted.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: That is not fair.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have no desire to be unfair.

Mr. Cross: The member for Subiaco was not fair to Western Australia.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is not the poorer people in the poorer suburbs who are behind the agitation. It is not the poor people of any suburb who want the second delivery. But the poor people in every suburb must consider the price they pay for this commodity, and cannot have regard to the whims or caprices of those people who desire and demand a second delivery, when such is unnecessary. There is no demand for a second delivery in any of the working-class suburbs of the city. I shall quote the opinion of a big retailer, who is associated with deliveries in suburbs of various types in the metropolitan area. I would quote, too, from a schedule submitted by the Milk Board showing the total deliveries of retailers in various suburbs and the quantities distributed in afternoon deliveries before the institution of these regulations. The men to whom I shall refer are typical of those engaged in the industry. One distributor advised the inspector that he had no afternoon delivery at

present, but delivered a small quantity in the summer, about five per cent. of the total; and that was Peppermint Grove trade. That afternoon delivery was required by hostesses who needed half a pint of milk or 6d. worth of cream for their guests and expected it to be delivered. The inquiries I have made indicate that those who can best afford refrigeration or are best able to pay for this particular service are the people who demand that milk be delivered twice daily. The manager of a very big concern in this State advised that he has had many years' experience in the milk industry. He made a comparison between districts such as those of Peppermint Grove and Mosman Park. He said that though he had had a request throughout the years from one or two people to deliver milk in the afternoon in Peppermint Grove he had never had such a request from Mosman Park. That particular distributor serves three hospitals, but not one of those institutions has asked for an afternoon delivery. A gentleman who is in a very big way in the milk industry in this city states that restricted hours would encourage a bigger output because more milk would be taken in the morning, whereas customers under the old conditions were likely to take a minimum in the morning and rely on an afternoon delivery for an extra supply. That was a point mentioned to me during the tea adjournment by the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall). I do not mind members scrutinising any of the documents from which I am quoting, but it must be understood that they are to be governed by the rules of Parliamentary privilege and members consulting these papers must not disclose the names of the persons concerned. I cannot be fairer than that.

I intend to quote from the experiences of retailers and producer-retailers, and the cases I shall submit will be typical of those in the metropolitan area. One vendor from Canning Vale delivers in the city of Perth and the Perth Road Board area. He distributes 70 gallons a day and has never had an afternoon delivery. Another man from Cannington sells 117 gallons a day and has not had an afternoon delivery. One man at Inglewood delivers 122 gallons a day in the Perth Road Board area and the city of Perth and he also makes no afternoon deliveries. Ninety-five per cent of the individuals whose names appear on this list exhibit no enthusiasm regarding an afternoon deli-

very and only a very small percentage is in favour of it. One big retailer disposes of 206 gallons a day at Cottesloe, Mosman Park, Claremont, Nedlands and Peppermint Grove, but he makes no afternoon delivery and is not in favour of one. The same applies to another man who sells 120 gallons a day at Peppermint Grove, Claremont, Cottesloe and Mosman Park; and, again, to another who delivers 236 gallons a day. Then there is the case of a man who is solely a retailer and who delivers 570 gallons a day. The member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) made an interjection to the effect that he wondered how that quota was obtainable. I should like to explain that a retailer is not bound to a quota.

Mr. Hughes: He has to get a license. A man cannot retail milk without one.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: He obtains a license, but has no quota. This man distributes 570 gallons a day. Generally he has no afternoon delivery, but in the summer time he has a demand for from one to 1½ gallons to be delivered in the Peppermint Grove district. I could go on quoting other cases. All the individuals concerned tell the same story, namely, that the demand for an afternoon delivery does not come from the districts occupied by working class or poorer people. One of the board's inspectors in a review of the situation clearly indicates that those making the most agitation for an afternoon delivery did not avail themselves of the opportunity to secure milk in the afternoon when that opportunity existed. I could name the people to whom I refer, but I will not do so. The inspector also indicates that in one instance in which a milkman delivers 3½ pints in the morning he has to travel three miles to deliver another half a pint in the afternoon, because the lady must have it before she retires for the night. He has to perform that service, because if he did not he would probably lose 20 customers in the one street. I ask whether that is a fair load to place upon industry; whether it is a fair burden to place upon those buying or selling milk. I suggest that everybody associated with the industry would be better off if such people were denied the right that is claimed for them by the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver).

Hon. P. Collier: They should have a glass of water instead of half a pint of milk.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have many references here to actual retailers and a good deal of information to which I naturally have access, all demonstrating that those agitating for an afternoon delivery did not avail themselves of the opportunity to secure an afternoon delivery even when they could. The hon. member said she obtained a lot of information from the Melbourne Milk Board. I suggest to the House that it is very difficult to persuade people to change their views on any particular subject, especially when they have sought information to support pre-determined ideas. Unfortunately all of us are subject to that weakness. We are all apt to advance the best side of the case from our point of view; but when we are discussing something of such great importance as this, I think it is well for us to allow our bias to be subjected to correction if essential facts can be produced suggesting we are in error. The hon. member said that she obtained from the Chairman and another member of the Melbourne Milk Board certain information in support of her contention. I suggest that the hon. member might have secured information more relevant to local conditions and to these regulations had she called at the office of the Milk Board in this State.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: I have often called there.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the hon. member does that I am sure she will be very welcome and the board will treat her with the greatest courtesy and supply her with any relevant information that has a bearing on this or any other allied subject.

I wish to quote from a letter received from Mr. Packer, chairman of the Melbourne Milk Board. Before doing so, let me explain that the City of Melbourne has had one delivery a day for 17 years, and for 12 years of the time previous to the institution of the board, it was on a voluntary basis, the retailers themselves having agreed. Their agreement, however, was upset by itinerant milk-vendors—we have had some of them here—riding around on bicycles, some of them with billy-cans, most of them yodellers, advo-

cating the advantages of their wares. They became a menace to the industry because they were selling milk from very questionable districts, produced under questionable conditions and threatening to injure the health of the community. Obviously milk can be sold at cut prices if the source of it is not desirable. Mr. Packer said—

For some years prior to the creation of the board in 1934, by voluntary agreement between the Metropolitan Retail Dairymen's Associations and Carters and Drivers' Union, a once-a-day delivery policy was endorsed and instituted. While many retailers observed this policy, others did not. There was no statutory provision making its observance compulsory. When the board prescribed the retail delivery hours to the early morning delivery, the hawkier type of dairyman went out of business. The public has been assured of a purer, safer and cooler milk supply under the board's regulation.

When the regulation was first introduced, a few persons objected, expressing the fear that women and children would be adversely affected by the once-a-day delivery. This fear has not been realised. The service available for obtaining extra milk, if required during the day, from house-trade dairies and milk shops has no doubt met this position. To-day there is an entire absence of any complaints from housewives. Metropolitan retail dairymen and the Carters and Drivers' Union are unanimous on the benefits of a once-a-day delivery.

The board, under its powers, has also introduced a retail delivery zoning scheme throughout the metropolitan area.

On the point of zoning, Mr. Packer has given valuable information of a system that will be adopted in this State. There is nothing new and nothing injurious in the system of one delivery a day. Members have gone to some length in quoting what Auckland or Wellington does, or what overseas countries do in the handling of milk supplies, but even people possessed of very vivid imaginations cannot show that anything injurious to the health of those communities has resulted from the adoption of such a system.

The member for Subiaco suggested that the Melbourne climate is better than the Perth climate for the keeping of milk. That impression is quite fallacious. Taking temperature alone, Melbourne has only one month of the year cooler in its summer range than Perth. During the summer and pre-summer months there is a greater degree of humidity in Melbourne than in Perth, and there are also other factors that increase the growth of bacteria in milk.

The simple type of cooler referred to by the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Fox) and the member for Perth (Mr. Needham) will keep milk at a temperature of less than 70 degrees, and our dry air in summer, the dry atmosphere, of course, being the cooling agency, causes the temperature inside such coolers to fall below 70 degrees. I intend to show for how long milk can be kept under the system adopted in Perth. An authority to whom I referred this matter says—

Any reasonably efficient cooler-safe with hessian sides should keep the temperature down to 70 degrees or less. Provided the temperature can be kept in the region of 65 to 70 degrees, which is well within the scope of this type of safe, the average milk delivered in the metropolitan area should be fit for consumption, even by children, after 24 hours.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: After six weeks.

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** Therefore the hon. member, in drawing that comparison, had not thoroughly examined the difference between the climatic conditions in Melbourne and in Perth. The hon. member spoke of treated milk, but I doubt whether many people understand just what is meant by treated milk. It does not refer to pasteurised milk. The hon. member said that some medical men object to treated milk, but I say that no medical man objects to treated milk as we know it—milk that has simply been cooled by having the heat extracted. Milk is so treated to reduce the growth of lactic acid bacteria and other injurious germs, but in the main is designed to prevent the milk from turning sour. Milk turns sour because of the growth of lactic acid bacteria. It is one of Nature's cleansing agents, absorbing other dangerous germs and rendering the milk more digestible. Therefore I point out that if milk turns sour after it has been treated, this does not mean that it was bad or stale milk. It may still be milk of the best quality, provided it has been properly treated.

One of the greatest menaces to the milk delivery system of any city is the lack of hygienic attention to utensils and appliances connected with the milking of cows and the cooling of milk. When we speak of treated milk, we refer to milk which has been brine-cooled, and which might have been milked 40 hours before being consumed, but it is none the worse for that. I would prefer milk brought from a country district, and pre-cooled 40 hours be-

fore say, to a temperature of 35 or 40 degrees, because such milk is more beneficial for adults and certainly better for children. I sharply disagree with the view that, because milk is brought to the city from country districts, it is in consequence likely to go stale and is not the equal of the product milked five minutes before being consumed. No authority can be adduced to show that treated milk—brine-cooled milk in which the growth of bacteria has been arrested—is not the best milk obtainable.

I do not wish that anyone should speak in a derogatory way of the milk supply of this city because of the contention that exists between the producer-retailers and those who are solely producers. There is much contention between those two elements, for a very important reason, namely because of the artificial set of conditions we have built up to protect the producer-retailer. In such districts as Murray-Wellington and that represented by the Deputy Premier, we have two sets of people side by side milking cows, one set for the butter-fat price and the other for the whole-milk price, and therefore we must expect contention, disagreement and dissatisfaction to exist because there is no comparison between the price for the one and the price for the other, although both those sections, on account of the high prices ruling for dairy products in recent times, are making a very good living.

I have referred to the treatment of milk by pasteurisation. It is well that the House should know to what extent pasteurisation affects that commodity. There are many advocates of pasteurised milk, and many people who will use milk only when it has been pasteurised. One of the reasons for pasteurisation is the reason why milk is cooled, namely, to kill germs. The process improves the keeping qualities of milk. By the destruction of germs, beneficial as well as injurious, we free it from disease. Another claim for pasteurisation is that it does not affect the dietetic value of milk. Many authorities object strongly to pasteurisation. I should like to quote one or two to show how medical men differ on that point. My first authority is the late Dr. Ralph Vincent, Senior Physician and Director of the Research Laboratory,

the Infants Hospital, Vincent's Square, London. He says—

After feeding thousands of infants on raw milk, and thousands on cooked milk, I have come to this conclusion—to produce tuberculosis in children feed the babies on a cooked food.

Dr. S. C. Hounsfield, Medical Officer of Health, Stowmarket, Suffolk, says—

Clean raw milk or pasteurised milk—which is the better? Of course, the former, without the slightest doubt. . . . We were not intended to live in a glass case, eat and drink nothing but sterilised food; if this were possible for a time then the first microbe would probably kill us. . . . If we sterilise or pasteurise milk, we might as well sterilise all raw foods, which is absurd. . . . It is most important for children and young adults to drink plenty of milk. The necessary amount of calcium salts cannot be supplied in sufficient quantities by any other food. Let them drink it raw without fear and trembling; let it be cooled as soon as milked and kept cold rather than heated, and let us push on with the campaign for producing clean milk. We shall not get rid of every microbe, and we may well thank God for that.

These words summarise the position—attention to cleanliness and hygiene, cooling the milk as soon as possible after milking; in short, the very activities of the Milk Board are those from which we may expect to have a good and healthful supply of milk. I have said I prefer chilled milk for my own use. Provided the milk is treated as it should be, that the utensils in the dairy and the dairy itself are kept as scrupulously clean as they should be, there is no reason why we should not be proud of any source from which the city obtains its milk supplies. We have definite evidence to show that in the city, because of the actions of the Milk Board, and the close collaboration between it and the dairy laboratory of the Department of Agriculture, it has been possible to test thousands of samples of milk, not only for butterfat, but bacteriological content, and that work is still going on. Late this evening the Superintendent of Dairying submitted to me some views that are so pertinent to this subject that I will quote his actual words. He said—

Country milk, which is milk being attacked as "old," is shock-cooled to approximately 37-40 F. within three hours of leaving the cow, at the most.

The meaning of "shock-cooled" is this: whereas milk may be of 60 or 70 degrees at one moment, in three seconds or less it

may have been brought down to 30 or 35 degrees. That is an absolutely effective method of retarding the growth of bacteria and keeping milk in prime condition. Whether the milk comes from Osborne Park or Harvey we find that in actual practice, by means of shock-cooling, though the milk may be 24 hours old when it reaches the city—because its temperature is not more than between 40 and 45 degrees, it has not shown any marked increase in germ content. The Milk Board in collaboration with the officers of the Department of Agriculture has gone to a great deal of trouble in this matter. The superintendent goes on to say—

Milk as drawn contains approximately 1,000 germs per cubic centimetre at 70 degrees F. Dealing with the whole of the supply of Perth for March, April and May, the superintendent points out that 65 per cent. of the milk does not exceed 100,000 germs per cubic centimetre—that is lactic acid bacteria. To cause milk to turn sour or coagulate through the effect of bacteria requires millions of germs per cubic centimetre. Here is a point requiring some explanation. Members have suggested that when milk turns sour it is unwholesome and unfit for human consumption. The longest living races in the world will not drink milk until it is sour. People should have no objection to sour milk. Some have suggested that milk becomes an offensive article because it has turned sour through some natural process.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: I did not suggest that.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: When we suggest sour milk is not wholesome we are doing the industry a wrong. Many thrifty mothers, including my own wife, take a delight in assisting milk to become sour so that they may use it for the making of sour milk scones. I know of no more palatable food.

Mr. Patrick: Buttermilk makes good scones.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes. Milk is coagulated for the manufacture of cheese. Probably many members eat that commodity. There is no doubt that every possible precaution is taken in this city to supply wholesome milk, and the actions of the board bear that out.

Mr. Marshall: I now understand why people put whisky in their milk.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have shown that no hardship is imposed upon individuals or hospitals, because milk of a desirable character is at all times readily available to them. I have shown that the tremendous cost of two deliveries a day is not borne by those who insist on the service, but by every consumer of milk, no matter what his or her standing may be. Taking all the points submitted by the hon. member I suggest no case has been made out by her. We desire to have larger quantities of better milk consumed in the city. We also desire that every precaution should be taken, not only for the health of children but of adults. Better hygienic methods in the home as well as in the dairy are important factors in the bringing about of that desirable position. The member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn) said that the Act would not be of much consequence if the regulations were defeated. If the milk Act is to be of service to the community it must be possible for reforms to be instituted through and under that Act. That legislation was introduced by the Government of the party to whom the hon. member belongs. No one of any consequence at all could submit an argument on which there would be any foundation for the statement that the Milk Board has not rendered very excellent service to the community. I wholeheartedly object to the motion, and I hope that the House will give it the despatch it deserves.

Mr. SEWARD: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco—in reply) [8.31]: I am sorry that the debate has not been adjourned, as it would have been had hon. members opposite been fair. The Minister no doubt has taken a great deal of trouble with his speech, and to reply to it as I would have liked to do, I should need some little time and some research. Since the Minister has said we on this side had already made up our minds and were already biassed when we came to give certain information, I may express the opinion that members opposite are also biassed and already determined to vote against the motion, and that anything I can now say is mere waste of time.

Mr. Raphael: There is much truth in that statement.

Mr. Fox: You only moved the motion for a bit of publicity.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I do object to ungenerous statements. I have never yet done anything for publicity in this Chamber. I moved the motion because I believed it right to do so. If this Chamber had the same number of women in it on one side as men on the other and a woman had been appointed chairman of the Milk Board, these regulations would never have been promulgated. Although some members have stated their point of view, it has been entirely a man's point of view. I speak from a woman's point of view.

Mr. Raphael: How do you know our wives have not told us what to do?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I do not know whether or not their wives have told members opposite what to do. I do know that all the speeches I have heard from those members on the motion have been pre-eminently from a man's point of view. Now I shall deal, as far as I can, with the arguments of each of those hon. members. The member for Canning (Mr. Cross) said, and other members associated themselves with his statement, that I was disloyal because I spoke of Eastern States milk.

Mr. Cross: Do not you think you were?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: If hon. members opposite had read my speech as I actually delivered it, they would know that I was not advocating the consumption of Eastern States milk. What I was trying to do was to show the House that these regulations were inducing people to take powdered milk or tinned milk; and naturally they would take the best they could obtain. The Minister has already told us that the milk I had in mind was the best powdered milk on the market.

Mr. Fox: Then, according to your own statement, you support Eastern States milk.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I am merely repeating what the Minister said, that that is the best milk. Being a woman I like to get the best when I buy an article. The member for Canning also said that children will not take sour milk. Of course they will not. The Minister has just told us that sour milk is a very good food. So it is. Almost every Continental cafe serves sour milk as a dessert, and it is excellent. But pasteurised milk does not turn into sour milk—which the Minister has advocated—but simply goes foul. And it goes foul more readily when it is not fresh.

The member for Canning also said that the milk is quite safe for babies at the stage at which we get it delivered to us; that is, I believe, when it is from 24 to 60 hours old. I contend that what the hon. member says is incorrect. I refute his statement. Fresh milk is better than milk which is old. The Minister instanced the fact that milk might be quite good after it had been in the refrigerator for some time. I have had milk in the refrigerator for many days; and if the hon. gentleman had read my speech he would have known that I had voyaged from England to Australia with people who had milk put into the refrigerator upon embarkation and had given it to their children every day on the voyage. The point of my reference to the matter, however, was that when the milk came out of the refrigerator, immediately it went into a different atmosphere, it started to decay. That was the point of my allusion. Milk can be kept in a refrigerator for many days. If it is put there immediately from the milking period until the time it is used, it may be perfectly fresh; but I again say that I would prefer to give absolutely fresh milk to children if I could get it. One hon. member—I do not remember who it was—suggested that the milk might be boiled; but boiled milk for children is not advocated by any doctor I have ever met, and I have met some hundreds. Never has its use been advocated by them for children, and it is never given if the mother has any knowledge of the subject of milk.

Mr. J. Hegney: Boiled milk is always advocated, though.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: It is not good for children. I noticed that the majority of members opposite spoke of the long hours worked by the retailers, and described them as "social outcasts." I particularly stated that I did not wish to deal with the long hours of milkmen, which really had no bearing on these regulations. The Minister now contends that the question of hours has something to do with the regulations. If that is so, it should have been mentioned when the regulations were promulgated and a declaration made that they had been framed because the milkmen were working too long hours. Personally I do not think the regulations can be mixed up with the hours worked by milkmen. It might just as well be said that newspaper

men work all night, and that miners work all night, and that—

Several members interjected.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The point is that if milkmen are called social outcasts, there is equal reason for calling journalists and miners social outcasts because they work at night. Several members have said that there has been no clamour against these regulations. Now, the other evening 12 women were outside this Chamber, and every one was a representative of a women's organisation. They asked to see various members of this House. Two members who passed them at this particular time said they did not wish to see them and did not wish to know anything about the question of milk regulations. Those women represented not only hundreds but thousands of women throughout the State.

Mr. Raphael: Were they authorised to interview members, or did they take it upon themselves to do so?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: They did not take it upon themselves. They were representative women. Yesterday I received this telegram from a woman in the electoral district of the hon. member interjecting—

Western Australian Housewives' Association carried resolution protesting against Milk Board's decision relating to one delivery of milk daily. Further, other members will vote against any member of Parliament who supports the regulations.

Mr. Cross: When was that put up?

Mr. Raphael: What is the name of the sender?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I will lay the telegram on the Table. I did not ask for that telegram. I could have had a similar message from every women's organisation throughout the State.

Hon. P. Collier: That is an offence rendering one liable to prosecution and imprisonment for threatening members.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: All I can say is that members are being continually threatened from the time they are elected until their term expires and they have been re-elected. Every member is continually being cajoled or threatened in relation to his actions. I have read the telegram.

Hon. P. Collier: Such representations should be put up by organisations, and not by individuals.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The member for Perth (Mr. Needham) said he represented the fathers of Western Australia. For my part I represent the children of the State. In my opinion, members of this House, generally speaking, do not appreciate what it means to a child to be deprived of fresh milk. If they had any knowledge on that score, they would not have talked the absolute nonsense and rubbish that we have heard.

Mr. Fox: Many have brought up children.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Members must know it is impossible properly to bring up children without milk. We heard some deery milk as a food and some members said they had been brought up without it. Any member who made that statement told an untruth because at one time every man here had to depend on milk.

Mr. Raphael: Yes, but from his mother.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Reference was made to the hours during which deliveries were permitted in Melbourne and Sydney. I disagree with the Minister's statement regarding climatic conditions, for I believe the Melbourne climate is much better for keeping milk fresh than is the climate of Perth.

The Minister for Agriculture: If I were you, I would not bet on that opinion. I gave scientific facts.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: On the other hand, I can quote Dr. Dale as saying that he would not give fresh milk to children in his clinics in Melbourne because he found it almost impossible to obtain a pure, uncontaminated supply. For that reason he uses powdered milk.

Mr. Raphael: You cannot avoid cranks at times.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: And cranks are not all on one side of the House.

Hon. P. Collier: Did someone quote Dr. Caporn?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The Minister quoted figures and also a statement from retailers to show that while they were delivering milk each morning, they were not in favour of afternoon deliveries because the quantities required for the later delivery were so small. I wished to put a question to the Minister at the time, but there was so much noise that I did not have the opportunity. I wanted to know whether he could give me the exact number of gallons represented by the deliveries. He mentioned that

5,000,000 gallons of milk were delivered in the metropolitan-suburban area—

The Minister for Agriculture: In 12 months.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I wanted to know what proportion of that 5,000,000 gallons was handled by the milkmen to whom the Minister referred. I have some figures that total nearly the same as those quoted by the Minister. I find, on calculating the deliveries, that they represent about 1,536 gallons daily on the basis of the number of distributors. As against the 5,000,000 gallons which the Minister said were delivered in the metropolitan-suburban area per day—

Mr. Raphael: The Minister said per year.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I should have said "per year." Figures provided by the Milk Board show that the daily deliveries represented 14,500 gallons. If that is so, and we can only reckon up 1,536 gallons per day on the Minister's basis, who delivers the rest of the milk? Then again I want to know if so many vendors refuse to deliver milk in the afternoon, why the necessity for the regulation? If the consumers do not desire the regulations and no one wishes to take milk in the afternoon, why bother about the regulations?

The Minister for Agriculture: The answer is obvious.

Mr. Fox: Some people at Peppermint Grove may want milk in the afternoon.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The member for South Fremantle (Mr. Fox) referred to infantile mortality figures for a number of years, but his statement was unfair because conditions generally have so improved that naturally infantile mortality has decreased.

Mr. Fox: I spoke of two years before the inception of the one delivery system and of two years afterwards. That was quite fair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Conditions have improved immensely regarding childbirth, to an extent that renders the hon. member's statement of little value.

Mr. J. Hegney: The position has retrogressed respecting the birthrate.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) asked the Minister if he would revoke the regulations should milk consumption decrease. That request was fair and the Minister replied that he would. I have been

informed by the largest wholesaler operating in the city that the consumption of whole milk is steadily decreasing all the time. That being so, I expect that the regulations will be cancelled very shortly.

The Minister for Health: If you continue advocating the use of tinned milk, that is quite probable.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The Minister said that I had advanced no real reason to warrant the disallowance of the regulations. I consider my speech included many reasons why they should be disallowed. Furthermore, leading articles have appeared in the "West Australian," which represents the view of a large proportion of the people of this State, advocating the disallowance of the regulations. On top of that, we have the associated road boards and municipal councils also urging their disallowance. Are all these people wrong, and the Minister and the Milk Board right? Surely not! Then again, the Minister said that the regulations would result in the price of milk being reduced. When I was in Melbourne I asked Mr. Packer a question that bears on that assertion. I asked him whether the one delivery a day and the zoning system had resulted in decreasing the price of milk to the consumer there and he replied, "No, they could not have that effect." I referred to that point in my speech, but apparently the Minister did not read my statement. On the other hand, Mr. Packer told me that, actually, they could have decreased the price of milk by 2d. a gallon, but had not done so because the board had insisted on so many additional overhead charges involved in the provision of machinery and hygienic appliances in retailers' shops, that the price of milk could not be decreased. I also pointed out that the price of milk in Sydney had been increased to 9d. per bottle, despite the regulations that provided for one delivery a day and the zoning system. Members will see that the price of milk there increased instead of decreased, and that will be the experience here. The Minister provided the House with a long dissertation on skim milk. I did not assert that skim milk was bad; I said it was quite good, but not the best for children. I displayed an advertisement to members and said I considered it contained misrepresentations regarding skim milk and that those misrepresentations were calculated to lead poor

people to believe that by using the article advertised they would give their children the equivalent of fresh milk. I presume this motion will be lost.

Mr. J. Hegney: That is presumption on your part.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Many members have probably received a letter from the Metropolitan Dairymen's Industrial Union of Employers. The Minister quoted quite a lot about the retailers' point of view and how they were suffering, what a fine body the Milk Board was, and how the retailers were entirely satisfied.

Mr. J. Hegney: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. member in order in introducing new matter when replying?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is certainly not in order if the matter was not introduced in debate.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: It is not new matter. I am merely repeating what the Minister said, and explaining that it is not borne out by the retailers. He said the retailers were sympathetic with what is being done. I wish to show that they are not in sympathy with what is being done. May I proceed, Mr. Speaker, if I am in order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not out of order if she is dealing with what the Minister said. The hon. member is certainly not in order if she is introducing matter with which the Minister did not deal.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I shall quote relevant parts. The extract says—

There is a very real danger of the board creating a serious monopoly.

That was one point I dealt with. I said that in Melbourne a monopoly had been created by similar action to that which we are taking here. If these regulations are allowed to stand—

The Minister for Agriculture: The hon. member will have a chance to vote against the board.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I am voting for the continuance of the board. I am now quoting what the retailers say.

The Minister for Agriculture: Not the retailers, but the representative of the retailers.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: This man, whoever he is, is the representative of the

retailers in the metropolitan area. He says—

The existing Act is a fearfully undemocratic piece of legislation, and the retailers' life earnings and business can be completely wiped out by the decision of the board.

I consider these regulations are an attempt to wipe out the retailers' living.

Mr. Tonkin: They make only 6s. a day, according to that.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The extract continues—

The existence and actions of the board have not improved the quality of milk.

The Minister said that the board's action had improved the quality of milk. The representative of the retailers says the Minister is not correct.

Mr. Raphael: Trouble begins when a couple get married.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The extract continues—

The existence and actions of the board have not improved the quality of milk, but will rather tend towards the creation of a deleterious effect. The quality of milk in Western Australia has always been of a very high grade, but by the continued increased costs saddled upon the retailer, it must either force him to protect his livelihood by the violation of the regulations, or to go out of business. The board has not encouraged the supply of the highest quality of milk, as is evidenced by the fact that it refused to approve of certain milk contracts.

The Minister has spoken so frequently of the board to-night that I presume that what he said is a pre-speech for to-morrow afternoon, when he will move the second reading of the Metropolitan Milk Act Amendment Bill. I feel, however, that the Minister, in mentioning the board, the retailers and the producers, has not been quite fair, because the organisation I have mentioned does represent the retailers. The Minister quoted but a few producers in comparison with the total number of producers throughout the State. He certainly did not quote the consumers at all. I am representing the consumers. I am representing the child who cannot get whole milk. The Minister, by these regulations, is doing everything he can to make it difficult for families to obtain whole milk.

Mr. J. Hegney: You are not representing my children.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I wouldn't, don't worry!

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER:** Almost every move in this House is for the benefit of some sectional interest, an interest that takes advantage of our democratic Parliamentary methods by lobbying members—

**Mr. Raphael:** What about the women's organisations you were talking about?

**Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER:** And using arguments to secure votes for their particular interests. In reply to the hon. member's interjection, the women were not representing sectional interests. They were representing the community.

**Mr. Raphael:** I do not in this Parliament represent Mrs. Cherry, and I will not be dictated to by her.

**Mr. J. Hegney:** Who did the lobbying?

**Mr. Needham** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER:** The hon. member was not present at the time. There were many women waiting outside the other night who wished to see him, but he would not interview them.

**Mr. Needham:** On a point of order; I desire the hon. member to withdraw the statement that when those ladies called to see me I would not interview them. I saw them.

**Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER:** I withdraw. The hon. member's words were, "When I speak in the House, you will hear then my decision about this."

**Mr. Needham:** Quite right. You said I did not see them. Tell the truth.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER:** I always am truthful. I withdraw the statement I made that the member for Perth (Mr. Needham) did not see the women. He did see them, but I meant to say that he did not speak to them. I believe that we, as politicians, are aware that we are not elected to legislate for any one section of the community. Our whole thoughts, our energies, should be concentrated on passing legislation for the greatest good for the greatest number. We come to Parliament to represent the people of the State, not sectional interests, such as some hon. members have been representing to-night. In creating boards, we give life to sectional interests. The Milk Board is an example. Although I shall vote for its continuance when the Bill is brought forward, nevertheless it is a board favouring a sectional interest. It will do whatever it can to secure a higher price for milk, or to re-

duce overhead costs. I do not know what we shall do when the whole community is governed by boards. I dare say that then the boards will fight one another.

**Mr. J. Hegney:** Then we shall have orderly marketing.

**Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER:** Throughout the world, the effect of such boards is palpable. They are created nearly always in countries where there are dictatorships. Russia, Germany and Italy live on boards; they have boards governing almost everything. Of course, in Russia the boards do not make money for sectional interests, but act for the good of the community. In other countries, however, boards are created entirely for the convenience of sectional interests.

**Mr. Raphael:** I wonder if Hitler is listening-in to-night!

**Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER:** I wish you were there, fighting against them.

**Mr. Raphael:** I have been up for enlistment, and was turned down, so don't poke that into me. No white feathers, as far as I am concerned!

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER:** I shall ask the House to divide on this question. I shall not mind if I am the only member who goes to the other side. So long as I remain in this House I shall stand for democracy and for the community as a whole and not for one sectional interest. I declare without hesitation that every vote in favour of the regulations will be one against freedom. The gentlemen who believe that people should be governed by democratic principles are the very ones who are deciding in favour of these unjust regulations. The gentlemen voting for these regulations will be voting for vested interests.

**The Minister for Agriculture:** That is a funny one.

**The Minister for Health:** You have been listening to too many bed-time stories.

**Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER:** I feel that behind all this is a sinister influence. Not the producers nor the retailers, but the wholesalers, the men with big capital are those who are influencing the Minister and members opposite to put through these regulations. It is not the retailers, the producers or the consumers, but the large wholesale interests who supply the party opposite with

funds for elections and similar purposes. That is why—

The Minister for Works: You are making yourself cheap and ridiculous now.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: No, I am not.

The Minister for Works: Yes, you are.

The Minister for Health interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the Minister to keep order.

The Minister for Health: Does the hon. member think that what she has said is decent?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Members opposite do not like the truth. I conclude by saying that regulations dealing with food-stuffs should be submitted to and approved by medical authorities before being gazetted. I do not consider that any milk board or Minister should introduce regulations of this kind without first obtaining a medical opinion.

Question put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	..	5
Noes	..	..	..	..	26

Majority against .. .. 21

AYES.	
Mr. Boyle	Mr. Watts
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Seward
Mr. McDonald	(Teller.)
NOES.	
Mr. Coverley	Mr. North
Mr. Cross	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Patton
Mr. Fox	Mr. Raphael
Mr. J. Heguey	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. W. Heguey	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Hill	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Triat
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willmott
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Wise
Mr. Millington	Mr. Withers
Mr. Needham	Mr. Wilson
	(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

## MOTION—UNEMPLOYED, HOMES.

### *Building Materials and Land Allotments.*

Debate resumed from the 6th September on the following motion moved by the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson):—

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that in order to assist approved unemployed or partially unemployed residents of the State to provide homes for themselves, the Government should supply the requisite material for the erection of such homes and, where necessary, should also make available suitable allotments of land for the purpose, the work of erecting such homes to be carried out by the persons so benefiting; technical assistance, if required, to be provided.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS** (Hon. H. Millington—Mount Hawthorn) [9.8]: I desire that the House should turn from one homely subject to a still more homely topic.

Mr. Sampson: The milk of human kindness.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) has placed before the House a very attractive proposal. He has submitted a scheme under which he says homes can be provided, or the material for them, at a cost of £64, £79, or—for a more elaborate type—£84.

Mr. Sampson: For material only, of course.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member suggests that no interest be charged for the first three years, and that afterwards a charge of 5 per cent. be imposed. He also asks that land be made available and that technical assistance be provided where required. There we have all the elements of a successful housing scheme. In view of the actual experience of housing schemes in this State, I think it would be well for me to inform the House what has been done by the Government in this direction. The project in which the Government has been interested has provided for at least six types or grades of houses. I consulted the Workers' Homes Board because I deemed it wise that members should know exactly what its experience has been, and we had to determine whether the homes provided under that scheme were too elaborate. During the financial year ended the 30th June last the board approved of 144 building applications of a value of £87,661, whereas in the previous year there were 102 building approvals of a value of £70,737. The expenditure on construction last year was £96,462, and the number of houses completed during the year was 128. The applications since the inception of the Act total 4,921, representing a value of £1,782,621. During the last three years the board has given special attention to the provision of smaller wooden houses at a lower cost. A large group of homes of this kind has been completed at Mosman Park, the cost ranging from approximately £460 to £560 and the rentals from 15s. to 17s. 6d. a week. The rentals include provision for rates and taxes, insurance, ground rent, interest and principal.

Mr. Doney: Over how many years?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: For wooden houses 26 years and for brick houses 32 years. For these cheap houses applicants are required to pay a deposit of only £5, together with £1 6s. lease fees. The security is by way of perpetual lease, which can be converted into a freehold title after the improvements on the land have been repaid. The ground rental charged is 3 per cent. on the appraised value of the land which is re-appraised every 20 years in accordance with the provisions of the Act. The board realises the necessity for providing homes for lower-paid workers and is pushing on with its programme as quickly as possible. However, there are very few districts in the metropolitan area where small wooden houses can be erected because of the brick-area restrictions imposed by municipal and road board authorities.

Mr. Raphael: There is plenty of room in Victoria Park.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Bayswater is relatively an outlying district, and yet the Bayswater Road Board has fixed a minimum value of £450 per home for that district. The Workers' Homes Board has purchased land wherever possible, and at a very low rate too, but it has been restricted in its activities because brick-areas have been declared not only in the municipalities but in the road board areas. The Workers' Homes Board requested the Mosman Park Road Board to approve of the extension to the adjoining allotment of homes of the type already erected, but the board refused; it insists on a minimum value of £600 for any home erected on the adjoining land.

Mr. Sampson: That is too high.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Last session the Workers' Homes Act was amended to empower the board to raise capital by borrowing, and we expect that the programme of building homes of a cheaper type will be considerably increased this year. The Premier informed me recently that he has made available for the purpose—this is additional to the amount previously provided—a sum of £5,000 a month or £60,000 a year. This amount will be utilised; applications have been received, and there is no doubt that the additional homes will be built.

Further, we have the small-loans scheme, which is an interesting phase of this work. The scheme was introduced during the depression to enable people to carry out re-

pairs, renovations and additions to their homes. An amount of £30,000 was expended on work of this sort during the last financial year and an additional sum of £9,000 was set aside by the Government for the continuation of the scheme. Loans totalling £31,717 have been approved under the scheme representing 266 applications. Loans are still being approved to the maximum amount of £300, repayable at 5 per cent. interest over an approved term, with a maximum period of 15 years for repayment.

Mr. Sampson: Applicants under the scheme would already have a home.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Those figures indicate the best that the board can do in providing not only the better type of brick house costing £800 or a little more, but also a cheaper type of home, the lowest having a value of £460, but the local authorities are now preventing the board from building houses of the cheaper type.

Coming lower down the scale, I have information about the McNess Housing Trust which was instituted in 1930 to provide homes for pensioners, invalids and other indigent people not in a position to get homes for themselves. The trust builds a small wooden cottage having four rooms and front and back verandahs, which is considered to be the cheapest type of house that can possibly be built. It has two bedrooms, a living room and a kitchen. I have a plan of this type of home before me, and the cost of the simplest type, without any ornamentation whatever, is £350 to £360. The trust has to keep the price as low as possible. Coming still further down the scale, members will recall the homes built for group settlers. They cost £200 to £250. Then there was a scheme introduced by the previous Government for providing houses on blocks of land of 5 to 10 acres on the Herdsman's Lake settlement. Those houses, which cost £250 to £260, were of the roughest possible type; they were unlined and, I believe, no bathroom was provided. I have a report on the homes built on that settlement. A sum of between £10,000 and £11,000 was spent on the 41 homes, and although the settlement was begun as recently as 1930, only 13 of the 41 original settlers remain. True, some of the settlers have improved their blocks, but the reports are that in many instances such improvements have not

been effected. Let me go still further down the scale in the endeavour to get somewhere near the price referred to by the hon. member. I would refer to the shacks built by the Government at the Canning dam settlement. They were merely temporary buildings for the reason that the jobs of the inhabitants would last but a few years. I have here the cost of a single man's cubicle, namely £36 unlined and £48 lined. For married men's quarters, two rooms and a verandah, the cost was £68 unlined and £135 lined. The tenants applied for the buildings to be lined as they were uninhabitable in their unlined state. Members will know what it must be like to live in an unlined weather-board building. For a married man, therefore, these very humble quarters, which will be removed within the next 12 months, cost £135. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) suggests that homes could be erected at a cost of between £64 and £84, and that the Government could experiment with 50 of these to begin with. I am afraid I cannot encourage him in that scheme. We have had the experience of workers' homes extending over a period—since 1913—of 26 years. The board has had experience not only in respect of the building of homes, but the purchase of land.

Mr. Sampson: The cost covers material only.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will refer to that later. Under the Workers' Homes scheme people have the opportunity to take up leasehold blocks. Is there any part of the world in which it is possible for persons to secure land under conditions as good as these? A valuation is placed on the land. Invariably the board buys well. It can acquire large areas, it puts the cost price on the land, and the householder is charged three per cent. on that value. From that point of view the board is very economical. The homes to which I have referred were built under the contract system, a highly competitive one. In every way the workers' homes scheme has been a success. We have realised in recent years that we must endeavour to revive the cheaper class of home, and that is being done. Those who have homes in an incomplete state are also able to come under the scheme. In the case of the McNess homes, I have pointed out that it is possible to get down to a minimum cost of

£350 per dwelling. The mover of this motion suggests that a block of land should be acquired and that the owner should pay £1 per month for it. He also suggests that, in some mysterious way, the land would be a security for payment. What security would it be? The owner would have no security, for he would have no title. It cannot be suggested that the Workers' Homes Board, if given charge of such a scheme, could lend money for materials with the land as security. It would have to take a chance whether the owner was capable of erecting a habitable dwelling. Despite the fact that there would be no security the hon. member suggests that on the material supplied no interest should be charged for the first three years.

Mr. Sampson: After the first three years five per cent. could be charged.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I should not like to think that any Government would carry out such a scheme. It appears to me that the scheme itself is somewhat mixed. The hon. member suggests that blocks of land could be acquired contiguous to industrial centres. The experience of the Workers' Homes Board is that the regulations of the local governing bodies do not permit of such a thing. This would mean that the people concerned would have to go outside the metropolitan area before permission could be given for the building of homes of the type referred to.

Mr. Sampson: Carlisle would be a good centre.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am doubtful whether the erection of such homes would be permitted there. I have shown that the shacks at the Canning dam, comprising two rooms and a verandah, cost £135. That was the cost of the actual building. The Government obtained the material at as low a price as anyone could, and seeing that the work was done departmentally the cost of construction could not have amounted to very much. The hon. member also suggests that technical advice should be given, whatever that means. Not everyone can handle tools. I daresay a trained carpenter would be capable of erecting his own home, but I do not know that the Government would be justified in supplying material to anyone

without first ascertaining whether it could be properly utilised. I now come to the suggestion that from five to 50 acres of land should be obtained. I think that was included in some previous suggestion of the hon. member.

Mr. Sampson: It was referred to in a letter.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I presume the hon. member is not mixing his housing scheme with the idea of workmen's blocks.

Mr. Sampson: No; it was suggested in a letter I received.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The scheme, therefore, is limited to industrial areas, and to the provision of the necessary land.

Mr. Sampson: It could be extended to country towns.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It would extend to those who were unemployed or were partially employed. It would be all right to consider supplying material at cost price and furnishing assistance in the building of the homes. The hon. member suggests that the total cost of these homes would be £84. That is not borne out by our experience. Much as we would like to make available some cheaper type of home I do not think it is the business of the Government, nor would it be desirable to build homes of that type, seeing that they could only be described as shacks such as have been erected at the Canning dam. We had better not start a first-class slum scheme, even were the cost of building undertaken by the owner. The extra cost would not be very great in such a case, but on the figures of the hon. member there is no prospect of providing homes at that price. Furthermore, no local authority would agree to such homes being built within the metropolitan area. The men concerned would have to be housed within a reasonable distance of their work. If they were taken 20 miles from Perth, or any given distance away, and houses were erected for them there, they would still experience difficulty in getting transport to their work. So it would not do from that aspect either. I regret that a scheme which looks so attractive on the surface cannot be accepted by the Government. I should mention that the Government is still determined to go on with the

workers' homes scheme to the limit of financial capacity. I have given the figures in respect of the annual extension of that scheme. The money that comes back in repayments is put into new homes. Further, an additional annual sum of £60,000 will be made available for the erection of the cheaper type of homes. Those homes are within the reach of even wage-earners on the lower rungs. It has been pointed out that homes built in Mosman Park can be made available at 15s. per week, which amount includes rates and taxes, insurance, ground rent and every other charge. That is an entirely different matter from merely renting a house. The tenant makes a weekly payment which includes all costs and also an amount capitalising over a period of years. But when one gets down below that scale, difficulties occur. Of recent years I have made many inquiries as to what could be done in respect of the cheaper type of home. Consulting with builders some years ago I was informed that they thought a weatherboard house could be erected for £400. Now, however, prices have risen, and the cheapest worker's home costs about £450. In the district I represent an extremely cheap type of house has been built, but even there the cost is nearer £500 than £400. They are perfectly decent-looking houses, but I am advised that they are about the cheapest type that can be built. For houses of that standard one has to go outside the brick areas. I am informed by the Workers' Homes Board that in many instances where cheap land is obtainable, the local authorities refuse permission to build weatherboard houses. That is one matter we might take up with the local authorities. Those authorities have autocratic powers in this respect. It is true that those powers were conferred on them by Parliament, but we now find that the Workers' Homes Board with all the goodwill in the world is unable to carry out its scheme. I really do not know how the problem of providing houses will be solved.

There is an illusion, too, in respect of owning one's own home. I do not know whether the mover suggests that if a man obtains a block of land on which he pays £1 per month, borrows the necessary money for materials or has them provided, and pays for assistance to erect the home, he owns in that home anything more than the total payments of £1 per month he makes in

respect of the land. The man may be under the illusion that the home is his own. Many people have that illusion after having paid a deposit.

Mr. Sampson: But such people are on the way to ownership.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Although not paying rent, they are paying interest, which amounts to the same thing. The homes are not theirs. I have known of many cases, especially before the depression, where men paid not only deposits but met many instalments, extending over two or three years, and eventually lost the homes. It is the merest illusion to suggest that a man owns his home when he has a block of land on time-payment and induces someone else, even though it be the Government, to erect the house. The problem is not solved by those means. The man may be relieved of paying rent, but assuredly he has to pay interest.

Mr. Sampson: The interest would be a very small sum.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Unless the hon. member's suggestion is that the Government can in some mysterious way provide money free of interest, his scheme is impracticable. And how long could the making of loans free of interest go on? It has to be remembered, too, that interest rates always have some relation to security. I cannot think of any worse security than that here outlined by the hon. member. In spite of that he suggests that the Government should lend money free of interest for three years and then begin to charge interest at 5 per cent. If the Government could do that, it could make the workers' homes scheme much more attractive. If instead of charging 5 per cent. or  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. on workers' homes the rate could be reduced by one-half, the workers' homes scheme would be extremely attractive. Although this Government or any State Government might desire to grant such generous terms, no one would accommodate the Government on the same lines. In respect of all money made available to this Government interest has to be paid. When money is obtained from the Commonwealth Government, the interest is simply deducted; it is not a case of paying interest. I had an illustration of that in connection with the wire-netting scheme. The Commonwealth Government

made money available to the State Government for that scheme, but deducted the interest when adjusting accounts. We administered the scheme, and charged 1 per cent. for that service. Because we had to collect our interest and sinking fund, instead of deducting it like the Commonwealth did, we found ourselves behind on that account to the extent of over £50,000 in my time. So that before we begin to lend money free of interest, or at a very low rate of interest, someone will have to show us how the money can be provided. I am afraid I can offer the mover no encouragement whatever. Further, it is a mistake to lead people to believe that they can obtain homes on such terms. If the scheme is to be financed under our system, it is unfair to suggest that an unemployed or partially employed man can be provided with land and material free of interest, and can own his own home. The whole scheme, I am sorry to say, is one that cannot possibly be entertained by the Government. I greatly regret having to discourage the hon. member, because I fully realise that the scheme, if practicable, would be a very fine thing for the tenant—which is all that the supposititious owner would be.

The hon. member will have to review his scheme in the light of his investments. I can hardly conceive the hon. member putting up such a scheme to the House. He is the last man I would have expected to do it. So that although I give him full credit for his philanthropic objective, I would tell him that neither this Government nor any other Government could adopt it. If we did adopt it, he would be the first member, when Estimates were being considered, to tell the Government that we should adopt business methods. The method of providing homes in the manner suggested is not one that would meet with approval from Parliament. I would not like to justify the scheme, or present its balance sheet, in say five years' time. The hon. member had better withdraw his motion, reconsider the scheme, and submit a different plan for providing cheap homes for the workers—a most desirable objective. I shall be very pleased indeed if he can show us a better scheme, one that would justify itself to Parliament. The plan suggested in the motion certainly cannot be said to justify itself. It holds out no prospect to the people of owning their homes. It offers merely the

prospect of a shack, involving an interest debt round the owner-tenant's neck. Therefore I hope the hon. member will not accuse the Government of turning down a practical proposal put up by him to us whereby unemployed or partially employed men can own their homes. That is an illusion, and no one knows it better than the hon. member. Therefore I must oppose the motion. I have spoken to it in order to demonstrate what is being done by the Government in a practical way to provide homes in the various grades I have mentioned. Our objective has been to meet the financial possibilities of the workers, whether they are fully or partially employed. In common with others, I regret very much the difficulties confronting those who are struggling, particularly those who are unemployed, to secure a home over their heads, but I am afraid the proposal of the hon. member will not solve that problem. If someone should discover how cheaper money could be provided for the Government, effect could be given to what the hon. member desires. Under existing conditions the Government must make certain that reasonable security is available, for we have to pay for the money we obtain whether by loan or other means. As I said before, the hon. member could very well reconsider the whole question prior to placing it before members again.

On motion by Mr. Triat, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.42 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 14th September, 1939.*

	PAGE
Questions: War with Germany—1, Public servants' superannuation benefits; 2, Air raid precautions	627
Bills: Life Assurance Companies Act Amendment, 3a.	
Rights in Water and Irrigation Act Amendment, Com.	628
Reserves (No. 1), 2a., Com. report	630
Metropolitan Milk Act Amendment, 2a.	631
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, Com.	635

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS (2)—WAR WITH GERMANY.

#### *Public Servants' Superannuation Benefits.*

Mr. SHEARN asked the Premier:—1, Has the question of the rights of civil servants and others under the provisions of the Superannuation and Family Benefits Act been considered in relation to those who may serve with the military forces? 2, If so, what action has been or will be taken to protect their rights?

The DEPUTY PREMIER (for the Premier) replied: 1 and 2, The matter is now under consideration.

#### *Air Raid Precautions.*

Mr. NORTH asked the Premier:—1, Does the policy governing air raid precautions emanate from Federal, State or local authorities? 2, Is any plan being worked out for the evacuation of civilians from the whole or portions of the metropolitan area? 3, What is the position regarding the stock, quality, and distribution of effective gas masks? 4, If undesirable, in the opinion of those responsible, that answers to 1, 2 and 3 be published, will the Premier make the same available to the Cottesloe Citizens and Parents' Association?

The DEPUTY PREMIER (for the Premier) replied: 1, The policy emanates from the Federal Government. The plans for A.R.P. are evolved by the State Government in co-operation with local authorities. 2, Preliminary planning for evacuation has been and is being considered by the State authorities. Actual evacuation depends